



LIBRARY RESOURCES & TECHNICAL SERVICES -

Cataloging Statistics: Report on an Experiment, Joan Patricia Warren and Walter M. Barnard • Duplicates Exchange: A Cost Analysis, Ian W. Thom • Acquisition by Standing Order, William B. Ready • A Note on "Command Papers", William H. Patch • Den of the Lone Wolf: A Shop Symposium • Short Cuts in Processing, Claribel Sommerville • Time and Motion Techniques Related to Costs of Expanding the Card Catalog, Thera P. Cavender • On Pre-Filing Sorting Methodology, Donald W. Johnson.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

VOL. I NO. 2

LIBR.

Vol. 1,

Catalog

Duplic

Acquisi

A Note

Den of

Short C

Time a

On Pre

Resour

Policy

Region

Review

LIBRARY RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

Vol. 1, No. 2

Spring, 1957

CONTENTS

	Page
Cataloging Statistics: Report on an Experiment. <i>Joan Patricia Warren and Walter M. Barnard</i>	67
Duplicates Exchange: A Cost Analysis. <i>Ian W. Thom</i>	81
Acquisition by Standing Order. <i>William B. Ready</i>	85
A Note on "Command Papers". <i>William H. Patch</i>	88
Den of the Lone Wolf: A Shop Symposium.	90
Short Cuts in Processing at the Public Library of Des Moines, Iowa. <i>Claribel Sommerville</i>	95
Time and Motion Techniques Related to Costs of Expanding the Card Catalog. <i>Thera P. Cavender</i>	104
On Pre-Filing Sorting Methodology. <i>Donald W. Johnson</i>	109
Resources and Technical Services Division. Report.	113
Policy and Research Committee, Cataloging and Classifi- cation Section. Report of Meeting.	116
Regional Groups.	120
Reviews.	123

Library Resources and Technical Services, the quarterly official publication of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association is published at 1407 Sherwood Ave., Richmond 5, Va. *Editorial Office*: Processing Division, Enoch Pratt Free Library, 400 Cathedral St., Baltimore 1, Md. *Circulation and Business Office*: 50 East Huron St., Chicago 11, Ill. *Subscription Price*: to members of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division paying ALA dues of \$6.00 or more, \$2.00 per year, included in the membership dues; to members paying less than \$6.00, and to non-members, \$5.00 per year. Single copies, \$1.25; orders of five or more copies (same issue or assorted), \$1.00 each.

Second-class mailing privileges authorized at Richmond, Virginia.

LRTS is indexed in *Library Literature*, *Library Science Abstracts*, and *Contents in Advance*.

Editors: Material published in *LRTS* is not copyrighted. When reprinting, the courtesy of citation to the original publication is requested. Publication in *LRTS* does not imply official endorsement by the Resources and Technical Services Division nor by ALA, and the assumption of editorial responsibility is not to be construed necessarily as endorsement of the opinions expressed by individual contributors.

EDITORIAL BOARD

<i>Editor:</i>	ESTHER J. PIERCY
<i>Managing Editor:</i>	CARLYLE J. FRAREY
<i>Honorary Editor:</i>	MARIE LOUISE PREVOST
<i>Circulation Manager:</i>	MRS. ORCENA MAHONEY
<i>Assistant Editors:</i>	HELEN M. WELCH, for Acquisitions PAUL S. DUNKIN, for Cataloging and Classification DAVID C. WEBER, for Copying Methods STEPHEN W. FORD, for Serials
<i>Advisory Editors:</i>	HENRIETTA HOWELL MAURICE F. TAUBER

Note to Contributors

Contributors are requested to observe the following points when submitting articles for publication in *LRTS*.

Manuscripts should be submitted in two copies, typewritten, double spaced, and on one side of the paper only. Name and title or position should be included immediately below the title of the article. If the paper has been read at a meeting, this fact should be stated.

The University of Chicago *Manual of Style* will be used in editing manuscripts for printing. The editor reserves the right to return a manuscript to the author for revision if it is not in standard form; or to make minor corrections if that can be done without changing the meaning or style of the article. While normal editorial care will be given to each manuscript accepted for publication, authors are expected to assume full responsibility for the accuracy of all bibliographical citations.

Cataloging Statistics: Report on an Experiment

JOAN PATRICIA WARREN AND WALTER M. BARNARD,*
School of Library Science, University of North Carolina

IN AN effort to secure factual data to facilitate a study of the need for and the utility of regularly-compiled and published reports of cataloging output in American libraries, the Division of Cataloging and Classification (now the Cataloging and Classification Section, RTSD), in January, 1956, invited all libraries to submit reports on their cataloging operations during the fiscal year 1955.¹ The reasons for the study and something of its background are described in the appeal for these reports. Although, under ALA reorganization, the DCC Committee on Administration, which had been designated to make the projected study, has now been discontinued, this summary report on the results of the 1956 experiment is being made for general information and in order that the data thus collected will be available for future study by the appropriate ALA agency. The completed reports and accompanying correspondence are on file at ALA headquarters.

The regular collection and dissemination of statistics on cataloging requires some general agreement upon the categories of statistics to be recorded in each library and some uniformity in the way in which the records are kept. This is the very heart of the problem. Two illustrations will serve to emphasize the point. In 1936, May Dornin reported upon a limited study of cataloging statistics kept by "fifty representative libraries" in the United States.² From the forty-eight replies received to the questionnaire, it was evident that there was wide disagreement over the definition of categories, considerable variation in the methods of counting within each category, and no unanimity of opinion whatever about which statistics were essential and which unimportant. A decided minority of the libraries replying (12.5 per cent) believed in or practiced any simplification of statistical reporting of cataloging activities.

In the middle 1940s, a Special Committee on Statistics of the Division of Cataloging and Classification attempted to specify standards for uniform cataloging statistics and to prescribe minimum statistics to be kept by each cataloging department.³ Since there has been no evidence of action resulting from this report, it appears that there has not as yet been any wide acceptance of the Committee's recommendations.

The present study does not identify the whole range of cataloging statistics which libraries may be keeping. It is evident from the replies, however, that a majority are keeping some record of the specific items

* Miss Warren and Mr. Barnard are candidates for the M.S. in L.S. degree. This report was prepared as a term paper for Library Science 211, Spring 1956.

requested in the appeal. There is no doubt that many libraries do find it necessary to maintain more detailed and more elaborate records. This diversity need not prevent uniform statistical reporting if all libraries could agree on certain specific categories to be recorded by all and could accept common methods of tabulation within these specified categories. While it is certainly true that real danger lies in the senseless recording of a multiplicity of detailed breakdowns, only the individual library can make a valid judgment whether a particular category of statistics is meaningful for its own operations. Thus there can be no legitimate regimentation of statistics gathering, nor does uniform reporting require it. The evidence of this experiment does point to a nearly-universal interest in certain common statistics, but it does not indicate with any precision how completely libraries may agree on methods for recording them.

The data for this report were received from college, university, public, and research libraries in the United States and Canada in response to the general appeal in the *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* cited above or in reply to a special invitation sent by DCC to all members of the Association of Research Libraries and to an arbitrary selection of other libraries in the United States. The special invitation and the general appeal both specified eight items of information to be reported, *viz.*:

- 1) Total library expenses for books, periodicals and binding during the period of the report;
- 2) Number of titles cataloged;
- 3) Number of titles recataloged;
- 4) Number of physical volumes or bibliographical units processed;
- 5) Number of physical volumes or bibliographical units withdrawn from the collections;
- 6) Percentage of cataloging done locally;
- 7) Number of professional employees engaged in cataloging operations; and
- 8) Number of non-professional employees engaged in cataloging operations.

In addition, all libraries were encouraged to offer comments and suggestions about the data requested, to include explanatory and interpretative comments when they thought these would be desirable, and to report any additional statistical information which they considered potentially useful in any uniform reporting program.

The statistics reported by those libraries which replied are tabulated in Tables I-III. Distinct groupings by type of library have been achieved, and where the number of respondents permits, an attempt is made to differentiate libraries having a relatively complex cataloging operation from those whose cataloging programs are probably somewhat simpler. This distinction has been made solely upon the basis of total expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding even though the authors recognize that this is not a completely valid basis for the distinction. Because the total number of respondents is small, and the range in the statistics

TABLE I
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES - GROUP I

Library	Total Expense ⁴	Titles Cataloged	Titles Recataloged	Volumes Processed ¹	Volumes Withdrawn ²	Percent Local Cataloging	Prof. Employees	Non-Prof. Employees
Brown	94,500	17,742	1,366	32,874	1,657	70	8 $\frac{3}{4}$	12
California (Berkeley)	481,500	31,165	1,728	58,288	5,196	53	21 $\frac{1}{2}$	26 $\frac{3}{4}$
California (Los Angeles)	378,600	36,546 ³	73,065	2,589	50	19	24
Chicago	185,000	19,088	173	19,350	10,480	52	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Columbia	354,100	45,163	5,212	105,125	20,075	57	30	28
Cornell	167,200	31,065	13,403	76,360**	1,460	55	11	9
Duke	158,500	20,073	764	33,976**	945	40	13 $\frac{1}{2}$	7
Georgia	68,300	6,644	841	14,637	400	47	8	14
Georgia Institute of Technology	69,400	6,866	1,287	21,516**	306	30	4 $\frac{3}{4}$	3 $\frac{1}{4}$
Houston	86,000	6,766	15,663	729	..	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
Illinois	447,200	45,684	3,663	103,622*	4,103	50	29 $\frac{1}{2}$	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
Indiana	263,000	17,732	914	29,916	791	20	11	12
Iowa	166,200	18,239	4,514	32,932	1,797	25	9	12
Iowa State	100,000	5,300	13,000**	3,900	18	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	3 $\frac{1}{2}$
Joint University	89,300	19,912	1,019	22,142	10,890	20	8	7
Kansas	211,600	18,670	267	34,252*	498	23	7	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
Louisiana State	154,300	10,140	968	25,157	1,162	30	6	5
Michigan	220,800	31,078	840	65,578	785	36	24	16 $\frac{1}{2}$
Minnesota	245,300	21,914	278	39,471	61	13	10
Missouri	115,300	5,479	182	17,907	5,029	5	2	3
North Carolina	210,900	15,197	861	25,070	40	7	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
Northwestern	129,200	21,708	34,819	1,245	65	6 $\frac{1}{2}$	6
Ohio State	219,600	26,489	5,440	52,043	3,565	35	14	18
Pennsylvania State	127,300	10,815	540	22,293	1,464	33	10	10
Princeton	154,400	19,940	1,656	35,457	1,911	66	11	12
BU		6,776	1,883	7585	651	31.6	4.5	5

16) 244

TABLE I (Continued)
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES - GROUP I

Library	Total Expense ⁴	Titles Cataloged	Titles Recataloged	Volumes Processed ¹	Volumes Withdrawn ²	Percent Local Cataloging	Prof. Employees	Non-P.f. Employees
South Carolina	48,600	4,642	1,599	9,847**	146	38	2½	3½
Stanford	108,700	17,000	732	17,006	9	7
Texas A & M	87,500	5,774	87	16,401	121	..	5½	3½
Virginia	122,500	22,764	38	36,221	717	50	5½	11½
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	47,000	21,720	10,749	25	5	3
Washington (St. Louis)	65,800	7,110	7,907	22,657	1,363	23	4½	5
Washington (Seattle)	168,200	13,495	680	26,865	2,008
Wayne	170,400	20,260	6,513	44,117	2,273	18	5	10½
Wisconsin	210,600	21,005	51,553
Yale	407,600	25,569	2,687	85,048*	11,433	40	38	26

1. Figures represent physical volume count unless otherwise specified (*indicates bibliographical unit count; **indicates uncertain, or unspecified)

2. Type of count is same as that shown in "Volumes Processed" column.

3. Not reported, or unknown.

4. Expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding, shown to nearest hundred dollars.

TABLE II
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES - GROUP II

Library	Total Expense ⁴	Titles Cataloged	Titles Recataloged	Volumes Processed ¹	Volumes Withdrawn ²	Percent Local Cataloging	Prof. Employees	Non-Prof. Employees
Agnes Scott	6,900	1,338 ³	1,479	7	1	1	1
Birmingham-Southern	7,900	1,204	405	2,423	111	15	1	3/4
Clemson	34,600	3,767	450	7,110**	563	20	1 1/2	3
Colby	17,300	3,580	65	3,862**	574	10	2	3
Drury	7,100	1,129	54	1,470	119	3	2/8	1/8
Goucher	11,400	1,332	836	1,699	957	34	1 1/8	1 1/2
Hamilton	14,500	2,914	166	4,541**	1,174	20	1	2 1/2
Hood	9,000	1,978	2,300	61	11	2/8	1/8
Idaho State	23,400	3,179	112	5,175	105	12	3 1/8	1 1/2
Eastern Illinois State	16,300	3,337	596	4,382	662	12	1	2 1/4
Illinois Wesleyan	4,500	1,542	1,781	3,390**	641	..	1	1 1/2
Kansas City	23,600	4,046	274	4,684	433	5	9/10	1
Keene Teachers	4,700	750	72	1,583	916	10	1/2	1/4
Long Island	19,000	4,800	143	5,241	68	..	2	4
Western Michigan	23,900	3,341	207	6,078	646	62	3 1/10	2/5
Mount Holyoke	23,400	3,368	230	5,536	1,617	25	3
Pacific	6,000	1,827	190	10	1/8	1
Redlands	12,900	227	3,095	2,750	..	1	7 1/4
Rosemary	10,500	2,151	191	10	1	5/8
San Antonio	6,000	968	631	2,498**	173	42	1/4	1 1/2
Wilberforce	7,000	1,425	1,425	3	1	2

1. Figures represent physical volume count unless otherwise specified (*indicates bibliographical unit count; **indicates uncertain, or unspecified)
2. Type of count is same as that shown in "Volumes Processed" column.
3. Not reported, or unknown.

4. Expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding, shown to nearest hundred dollars.

TABLE III
PUBLIC LIBRARIES - GROUPS III, IV, & V
SPECIAL LIBRARIES - GROUP VI

Library	Total Expense ⁴	Titles Cataloged	Titles Recataloged	Volumes Processed ¹	Volumes Withdrawn ²	Percent Local Cataloging	Prof. Employees	Non-Prof. Employees
<i>Group III</i>								
Cleveland Public Library	362,000	20,064	674	134,248	95,770	..	14	23
Enoch Pratt Free Library	344,300	10,278	535	110,370	54,905	..	9	24
New York Public Library (Reference Dept.)	288,600	50,310	6,351	81,693	778	..	39	57
Free Library of Philadelphia	353,600	10,836	3,656	117,323	117,380	..	9½	16
<i>Group IV</i>								
Atlanta, Georgia	134,000	7,491 ³	44,105*	20,969	40	5½	4
Denver, Colorado	107,800	6,207	232	30,785	14,069	..	7	5
Grand Rapids, Michigan	47,000	4,502	1,368	16,908	12,414	10	3	1
Mount Vernon, New York	31,400	4,016	209	7,045	8,962	..	4	5½
St. Louis, Missouri	199,800	7,653	221	58,940	63,899	58	5½	1
Stockton, California	42,200	3,987	278	16,304	8,204	..	3	2
Tacoma, Washington	74,000	6,368	26,528**	8,671	5	2½	5¼
Youngstown & Mahoning Co., Ohio	79,800	5,840	32,488	14,521	37	3	6½
<i>Group V</i>								
Albany, New York	28,900	7,751	10,480	13,960	52	1½	2
Aurora, Illinois	16,400	3,025	20	6,016	6,112	..	1½	1¼
Ferguson Library, Stamford, Conn.	24,000	4,071	14	11,392**	5,565	75	2½	2½
Great Falls, Montana	25,900	5,764	103	5,867*	2,086	4	1	2
Jackson, Mississippi	28,300	10,483	1	3
Lima, Ohio	20,100	2,761	17	8,950	10,217

TABLE III (Continued)

TABLE III (Continued)
PUBLIC LIBRARIES - GROUPS III, IV, & V
SPECIAL LIBRARIES - GROUP VI

Library	Total Expense ⁴	Titles Cataloged	Titles Recataloged	Volumes Processed ¹	Volumes Withdrawn ²	Percent Local Cataloging	Prof. Employees	Non-Prof. Employees
<i>Group VI</i>								
Armed Forces Medical	163,300	13,169	6,277	19,484**	2,368	..	29	24
Illinois State Library	82,500	24,281	10,008	55,108	20,682	82	10	11
National Research Council, Canada	29,982	20,647	50	2	3
Ryerson Library of Art & Burnham Library of Architecture	10,716	925	208	1,333	375	25	2	3/4
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture	36,400	10,461	1,386	19,277	526	99	51/10	6

1. Figures represent physical volume count unless otherwise specified (*indicates bibliographical unit count; **indicates uncertain, or unspecified)

2. Type of count is same as that shown in "Volumes Processed" column.

3. Not reported, or unknown.

4. Expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding, shown to nearest hundred dollars.

reported so great, no attempt is made to specify any medians or averages. With these data reported here, no measures of central tendency are likely to have validity or utility.

There were seventy-nine usable replies to the appeal to submit cataloging statistics. These may be categorized as they are recorded in the tables as follows:

- 1) Group I. College and university libraries having expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding in excess of \$40,000 per year—35 replies.
- 2) Group II. College and university libraries whose book expenditures were below \$40,000—21 replies.
- 3) Group III. Public libraries with book expenditures over \$250,000 per year—4 replies.
- 4) Group IV. Public libraries with book expenditures between \$30,000 and \$250,000 per year—8 replies.
- 5) Group V. Public libraries with book expenditures of less than \$30,000 per year—6 replies.
- 6) Group VI. Special libraries—5 replies.

Most reports are for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, a few are for the calendar year, and isolated reports cover fiscal years ending on some other date than June 30. This variation in report year does not affect the uniformity of the reports, however, and the variation is not recorded in the tables.

Findings of the Study

Value of uniform cataloging statistics. Generally speaking, most libraries seem to have reacted favorably to the suggestion that some sort of uniform reporting be introduced. Some quite enthusiastic participants hailed the project as long-overdue and stated that they were awaiting the results with great anticipation. Others believed the study to have utilitarian value. For example, one university expressed the hope that out of the study might come some uniform figures to furnish a valid basis for comparison between the work of comparable institutions and possibly to aid the administrator in determining the optimum size of the cataloging staff needed for operations at their present level or at various possible rates of growth. Another believed the introduction of uniform statistics might provide the basis for closer control over the activities of cataloging departments "with an eye to economies in time and money." Still another expressed the hope that such compilations would simplify the work of the administrator faced with the task of making annual reports and filling out innumerable questionnaires which clog up his in-basket. Most of the favorable replies, however, gave unqualified statements of polite assent.

A few libraries were quite positive in their rejection of the whole effort to arrive at uniformity. The chief objections voiced by these respondents can be summarized as follows:

- 1) The wide variety of organization, activities and purposes of cata-

logging departments makes any standardization of statistics impossible. Among the objections cited, this was the one most frequently mentioned. Those referring to it emphasized that each cataloging department is more or less unique, including within it activities which are either different from or totally incommensurate in nature to those found in another department. The respondents observed further that countless unforeseen and completely uncontrollable variables such as quality of materials, skill of staff, and unusual working conditions operate throughout the cataloging process and make valid and reliable comparative data impossible to report.

2) Published compilations might invite invidious comparisons among institutions. This objection grows out of the first and was stated frequently with more force than was the first. A few extreme replies suggested dire consequences of such reporting. The proposed compilations, these alleged, would leave all libraries completely unprotected from all manner of unwarranted comparisons and put the hapless librarian and his staff in a state of acute embarrassment.

At this point an observation concerning the fear of comparison seems in order. It is simply that all statistical reports can be used to make unfair comparisons, no matter how many variables have been isolated successfully and controlled; all such compilations are only relatively immune from misinterpretation. It follows, therefore, that all statistics must be read with full realization of their limitations. When these limitations are admitted, most compilations can and do afford some useful reports on existing conditions, and they may even indicate general trends when comparable data are given in successive reports.

The statistics reported in *College and Research Libraries* each year illustrate this point well. Their lack of specificity and uniformity make them susceptible to misinterpretation. For example, the figures on per student operating expenditure do not necessarily give an accurate conception of the extent to which the library function is supported by each institution. Variable methods in counting students enrolled in partial programs, short or correspondence courses and other special programs affect these totals, and in some universities, such enrollees may not even be counted at all. For any two institutions, therefore, this method of equating library support is invalid unless the same counting method is employed. Another example is the misleading nomenclature of positions. Many an assistant librarian or department head in a small library would be counted as a professional assistant in a larger system.

Realizing the inadequate and imperfect nature of these annual reports, the compilers have issued repeated warnings against making comparisons based on figures alone. They have stated quite frankly on occasion that while every effort is made to arrive at precision and comparability in each report, much of the material in the tables is little more than "interesting quantitative data." Yet these limitations have not invalidated the ACRL statistics reporting program, and these reports continue to provide valuable data which do give a general over-all picture of each

institution and do afford a basis for making a few cautious comparisons.

In the light of this realization, one of the major objections to uniform reporting of cataloging statistics seems to lose some of its force. If such statistics are reported and their limitations recognized, they may have some very real use in suggesting (not establishing) standards for measuring output and standards for staffing. They may also furnish some indication of trends in cataloging activities and procedures in American libraries, and they are likely also to motivate each library to think critically about its own cataloging procedures and methods. There is, however, another more serious objection to uniform cataloging statistics suggested by several participating libraries.

3) The nuisance of keeping worthwhile statistics defeats their primary purpose. This objection reflects a more sober and practical attitude than the second. It is based upon the realization that the statistical measures necessary to insure standardized comparable reports on cataloging output may be too complex to justify their use. If excessive energy and time are required to keep statistics, their value in promoting efficiency and economy is largely lost.

Item-by-item analysis. In collecting the reports from various libraries, no standardized form was used. The reason for this is evident, since a standard form can be devised only after there is general agreement upon the scope and complexity of the reporting program. The eight items of minimal information requested are given above. Although the requests for data asked for additional suggestions and explanatory comment, most libraries confined their replies to the items requested. Enough sent detailed reports to make an item by item analysis of the responses worthwhile, however.

Several other statistical items were suggested as having equal or greater value than the ones requested, but there does not seem to be enough uniformity in these suggestions to warrant their inclusion in any standardized report form that might be evolved in the future. These suggestions are reported later in this paper.

The discussion of each item which follows attempts to identify areas of possible agreement and also to indicate those areas where reconciliation of disagreement seems unlikely.

Item 1. Total library expenses for books, periodicals, and binding for the period covered, shown to the nearest hundred dollars. This was included to give some basis for judging the relative size and complexity of cataloging operations in the reporting libraries. While some libraries reported separate figures for "books," "periodicals," and "binding," the collective total seems adequate to achieve the purposes for which it was reported. Separating the total into its components might require distinctions which some libraries do not make.

Item 2. Number of titles cataloged (Include here each monograph, new (*i.e.*, not-previously-cataloged) serial or periodical title; pamphlet cataloged as a separate item; thesis; music score; phonograph record;

map; microfilm; motion picture film; filmstrip; etc., for which a separate "main" or author entry is prepared for the catalog. Include analytical entries and added editions for which separate entry is made. Do not include added copies, continuation volumes, or items in series not given independent entry in the library's catalog). All but one public and four college and university libraries responded to this item. Indeed, this would seem to be one statistic almost universally kept. It is also one that admits of little misunderstanding or ambiguity. Some libraries furnished a detailed breakdown by type of material, such as serials, films, music scores, records, microfilm, pamphlets, maps, etc. Again this specification seems unnecessary for the purposes of uniform reporting since the activities and decisions involved in cataloging these non-book materials are not significantly different in kind from those involved in cataloging books.

One library keeps a record of foreign language titles cataloged. Conceivably this statistic, if kept by all libraries, might introduce a refinement into the figures reported for titles cataloged. It is reasonable to presume that foreign language materials will require more cataloging time and effort as a rule than will English language titles. Thus the ratio of foreign language titles to the total number of titles cataloged refines this measure of cataloging performance. The practicability of recording this figure in all libraries is a moot question, however.

The term "analytical entries" also gave some difficulty. Some libraries seem not to have been quite sure what was meant by the term in this context. Others admitted that they kept no such statistic. This misunderstanding underlines the compelling need for painstaking definition of all terms to be used in a uniform statistics report.

Item 3. Number of titles recataloged. (Recataloging, as used here, includes any correction, revision, or change which involves a "cataloging" judgment or decision as opposed to mechanical correction or errors). Here again this item seems to have elicited rather uniform results. Most of the college and university libraries (80 per cent) and of the public and special libraries (76 per cent of the combined group) replied. A few minor questions were raised, however. One library reported the figure in terms of physical volumes recataloged. This figure was simply tallied under item 4 which asked for the total of physical volumes processed. Another library was confused about what constituted "recataloging" and asked if changing a call number or one or more subject headings could be considered as such. While the request attempted a fairly explicit definition, it seems not to have been explicit enough. One of the special libraries suggested that this item be separated into two categories: "a) the number that can be added to an existing shelf card, and b) the number requiring completely new sets of cards."

Item 4. Number of physical volumes or bibliographic units processed (specify which unit of measurement is reported and include the number of physical volumes or bibliographical units processed in items 2 and 3, plus all added copies, continuation volumes in sets and series, etc. If feasible, include count for non-codex material by equating each non-

codex unit with a codex unit (1 phonodisc equals 1 volume; 1 reel of film or filmstrip equals 1 volume, etc., or report as bibliographic units). All libraries reported something on this item. But 19 per cent of the public and special libraries and 16 per cent of the college and university libraries failed to indicate whether they were reporting bibliographic units or physical volumes. This may be attributed either to oversight or to failure to distinguish between the two methods of counting. One library reported in terms of "items accessioned." This is not an equivalent figure, however, for virtually all libraries catalog items which are not accessioned and accession many items not cataloged during the period covered by a single report.

The counting of added copies raised an interesting point. One respondent observed that adding one copy of 100 different titles would require a great deal more time and effort than adding 20 copies of each of 5 different titles. And yet, both operations result in the same count. The elaboration of statistics necessary to indicate this important but complex distinction is probably too burdensome for any library to maintain.

Item 5. Number of physical volumes or bibliographic units (specify which) withdrawn from the collection. (Definition same as for item 4). All but one college and university library and one public library furnished answers to this item. Many of these failed again to indicate whether their count was in bibliographic units or physical volumes. Public libraries indicated large numbers of books withdrawn from their collections; some of the larger university libraries also reported large withdrawals. Because the withdrawal of a cataloged item requires significant expenditure of time, the inclusion of this measure in any statistical report seems necessary in order to give a more accurate record of cataloging department performance.

Transfers should be excluded from this count, for although they are withdrawn from one part of a library, they are reshelfed in another part of the library system. If extensive alterations in catalog records are required, transfers would be counted under both items 3 and 4; if such alterations are minor or merely mechanical, the count would be made only under item 4. Lost books, on the other hand, are clearly included in this withdrawal category. "Books decataloged" might be substituted as an equivalent term for withdrawals.

Item 6. Percentage of cataloging done locally (specify whether measured or estimated), *i.e.*, without the use of catalog cards or assistance from the Library of Congress, the H. W. Wilson Company, or any other source outside the library system. Of all the items, this gave the most trouble to reporting libraries. The replies may be broken down as follows: 87 per cent of the college and university libraries furnished replies to this item, 60 per cent of which were estimates; 52 per cent of the public and special libraries furnished replies, 54 per cent of which were estimates.

Without exception the reports seem to be based on the number of titles for which printed catalog cards are not used and not on the desired distinction between different procedures in cataloging. Normally books

cataloged with no aid from outside sources require more time and more cataloging skill than do those for which printed cards are used or for which complete catalog entries may be found in the Library of Congress printed catalogs or among the LC proof slips. Since most libraries seem to have interpreted this item to mean "percentage of cataloging for which *cards* are prepared locally" whether or not these cards were derived from printed models, the figures reported for this item do not provide the measuring device intended by the request. It is entirely possible, of course, that this distinction is not typically made in many cataloging departments.

Item 7. Number of professional employees engaged in cataloging operations (report in full-time equivalent). This item seemed to give little trouble. A few questions were raised however. One library inquired whether a chief of technical processes should be counted as a professional employee in the cataloging department. The neatest solution to this problem is to be found in reporting in full-time equivalent the number of hours he devotes to activities involving the cataloging department. But since most of the activities of a chief of technical processes are likely to reflect the integration which such an organization pattern intends to achieve, it is not clear whether any meaningful allocation of his time to specific activities is feasible.

Another question relates to the proper reporting of "sub-professional" assistants. The common sense solution here is to report such personnel according to the type of activity in which each is engaged. Thus sub-professionals should be considered "professional" or "non-professional" on the basis of the kind of jobs they perform.

One university library suggested that item 7 should include a specification of the standard work week and the annual sick and vacation leaves given each employee. Unquestionably such matters do have direct bearing on the cataloging output of a department, but it is most unlikely that any standardized report could provide for the many variations which would need to be represented. It is possible, of course, that such information could be given in a footnote.

Item 8. Number of clerical and non-professional assistants engaged in cataloging operations (report in full-time equivalent). This item was not troublesome enough to require any extensive discussion. A few college and university libraries were troubled about the status of student assistants. It seems clear that such assistants ought usually to be counted in full-time equivalents with the other clerical and non-professional assistants.

Miscellaneous points. The questions and comments of the respondents in this experiment fall into two groups: 1) those which relate to the validity of reports on cataloging statistics, and 2) those which suggest additional measures thought to have value in any regular reporting program. In the first category, in addition to some points already discussed in the preceding section, one or more libraries called attention to these factors which would affect cataloging output:

- a) Reorganization of a cataloging staff.
- b) Disruption accompanying the planning and construction of, and the movement into new quarters or a new building.
- c) Number of separate catalogs maintained in a library system.
- d) Maintenance of name and/or subject authority files.
- e) Type or types of cataloging done, e.g., brief, full, bibliographic, temporary.
- f) Incidence of cataloging added copies for branch and departmental libraries at times not simultaneous with the processing of the main library copy.

Additional items of information suggested for inclusion in regular statistical reports included:

- a) Comparable figures for the year previous to the report.
- b) A checklist of activities performed by the cataloging department.
- c) Figures showing the average output per cataloger.

Conclusions

Since this experiment in statistics reporting is intended to be preliminary to further study of the desirability and feasibility of uniform reporting of cataloging statistics on some regular basis, no attempt is made here to suggest any real conclusions in the usual sense. Nevertheless, the replies from libraries submitted for this study and the analysis made of them in this report suggest the following points for consideration in any subsequent study of this problem:

- 1) The number of responses in this experiment was almost certainly insufficient to provide any really representative cross-section of methods for compiling cataloging statistics.
- 2) Since the appeal for responses was made so widely, the small number of replies probably reflects a general lack of interest in any uniform reporting program.
- 3) Most of the respondents limited their replies to unqualified figures on the eight suggested items. This resulted in reports which were easily combined with the reports from other libraries but they probably give a deceptive picture of order where, in reality, considerable confusion and ambiguity exists.
- 4) The number of inevitable areas of ambiguity in cataloging statistics results in serious limitations on the value of standardized statistical reports.
- 5) All attempts to arrive at some acceptable reporting form must endeavor to resolve a dilemma which is inherent in the problem itself, viz., the specification and detail necessary to achieve comparability in the reports from different libraries are impractical from the standpoint of the effort and the expense required.

REFERENCES

1. Frarey, Carlyle J., "Uniform Cataloging Statistics: Help Wanted," *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, 12: 47-49, January, 1956.

2. Dornin
Catalog
1936. J
3. ALA.
port,
4. Sum

Dup

THE
ha
brary,
of exc
that th
tinued
fairly
beyond
plus th
necessa
in the
strict
period
us to a
In add
piling
It
definit
analys
Libran
than t

Cost o
Du
brarie
and tw
Up
brary
items,
than f
took,
ing w
as cor

2. Dornin, May, "What Cataloging Statistics Do You Keep?" In ALA. Catalog Section. *Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook*, No. 5. Chicago, American Library Association, 1936. p. 81-85.
3. ALA. Division of Cataloging and Classification. Special Committee on Statistics. "Report, 1945-1946." In ALA. DCC. *News Notes of the Board of Directors*, vol. 2, no. 4, Summer, 1946. p. 12-13.

Duplicates Exchange: A Cost Analysis

IAN W. THOM,

Chief of Technical Services, Northwestern University Library

THE statement is often made that the Duplicates Exchange Union has little to offer the large research library; that the larger the library, the less the profit in this method of exchange. Those in charge of exchanges at the Northwestern University Library were quite sure that this was true; but by the momentum of tradition the Library continued, albeit half-heartedly, to exchange duplicates in this manner until fairly recently. About two years ago the decision was taken, for reasons beyond the scope of this article, to reduce the exchange staff. This action, plus the growing pressure of other kinds of exchange work, made it necessary to take a clear-cut stand for or against continued participation in the Duplicates Exchange Union. It was decided therefore to keep a strict accounting of our exchange dealings with Union members for a period of six months. This was done, and all statistics that would enable us to arrive at the actual cost of exchange in this manner were analyzed. In addition to computing the cost of acquiring material, the cost of compiling, mailing, and servicing a duplicate list of our own was determined.

It should be stressed that where estimates had to be made, they are definitely on the conservative side. The tendency throughout the cost analysis has been to understate the case. Hence, the actual cost to the Library of carrying on the activities described below is somewhat higher than the figures given would indicate.

Cost of acquiring material

During the test period 53 exchange lists were received from 30 libraries. Thirty-nine of the lists offered serials only, 12 monographs only, and two, a combination of both.

Upon receipt of a list, someone fairly well acquainted with the Library's holdings and collecting policies had to scan it to decide which items, if any, were worth searching. Some lists were disposed of in less than five minutes, but those with 15 to 20 pages of closely-spaced serials took, of course, much longer to examine. Most of this preliminary checking was done by the Chief of Technical Services; but to make the report as conservative as possible, a lower rate of pay than his was used in com-

puting the cost of such checking. Figured at our arbitrarily low rate then, the cost of the preliminary examination of these 53 lists came to \$20.00.

The next step was to have each list searched against the public catalog, the serial catalog, or the serial want file. The preliminary checking had eliminated 6 lists, leaving 47 to be actually searched. The average searching time per list was 17 minutes. At the rate of pay of superior student assistants, the labor cost of searching 47 lists came to \$15.00.

When the searching revealed that the Library needed a certain item, correspondence had to be sent out requesting it. If the item were a monograph, a card (corresponding to an outstanding order card) was made for the public catalog. If it were a serial, a notation had to be made on the appropriate card in the serial want file showing which issue was asked for and from whom we asked it. Items were requested from 20 lists, and it took at least 15 minutes per list to write the correspondence and make the necessary records. Then, if requested material arrived, postage very often had to be refunded. If we include the postage refunding time in the fifteen minutes mentioned above and compute the cost at the pay rate of the exchange assistant involved, the total cost of these activities was \$10.00.

Postage refunds amounted to \$2.25.

Cost of sending out material

One of the awkward things about receiving material on "exchange" is that one must reciprocate by sending material out. The published *Procedures* of the Duplicates Exchange Union specifically states that all members should send out *at least* two duplicate lists per year. Corresponding to the half-year period of our survey, therefore, we should have sent out at least one list. The list whose costs are analysed below was actually sent out somewhat before the six-month period in question, but for the purposes of this study, the two sets of costs will be juxtaposed so that the combined costs of sending and receiving duplicates for a typical half-year (assuming two out-going lists a year) will emerge with clarity.

Parenthetically, it might be mentioned that even when the exchange staff was double what it was at the time of the survey, lists were not sent out very often. The reason for this is plain: the compilation of an exchange list and the servicing of requests from it are burdensome activities, and confronted by other demands on his time, an exchange assistant will not readily undertake such activities unless the benefits to his library are obvious.

Let us proceed, however, with a cost analysis of the last exchange list sent out; the one which, for the purposes of this report, will correspond to the six-month period of our survey.

1) Prior to the compilation of the list, items suitable for inclusion were culled from the general mass of duplicates and then shelved alphabetically by author or issuing body. Over approximately a six-month period this task took about five hours a month to make a total of some 30 hours. At the pay rate of the assistant involved the labor cost here was \$60.00.

- 2) A stencil was then cut from the rough slips which had been prepared when the books were originally selected for exchange. This took five hours and cost the Library \$7.50.
- 3) Then the stencil was run off and the sheets assembled and stapled to form a relatively small three-leaf list. Labor cost: \$4.00.
- 4) The cost of materials, that is, stencil sheets and mimeograph paper, amounted to \$1.30.
- 5) The lists were then addressed, folded, stapled, return address applied with a rubber stamp, and postage stamps affixed. Labor cost: \$7.00.
- 6) One copy was mailed to each member of the Duplicates Exchange Union second class at two cents per list. Postage cost: \$2.38.
- 7) Then the requests began to arrive. This meant looking through the correspondence, locating the wanted books, typing labels, packing the books in mailing bags, and computing postage. This took about 20 hours, and based on the pay rates of the personnel involved cost the Library \$35.00.
- 8) The cost of the labels was negligible, but at least five dollars' worth of mailing bags were used.

Value lost through not selling

This cost analysis would not be complete if we failed to consider what was lost to the Library through not selling to dealers and students materials distributed by means of the exchange list discussed above. A careful examination of the latter and a comprehensive knowledge of what kinds of material were bought by dealers and students during the last five years leads inescapably to the conclusion that the Library would have received \$30.00 (gross) had the materials on the list been offered for sale.

The net gain would have been smaller of course. It costs money to sell books, particularly to hold student book sales, and most of the items on the list would have been bought by students rather than by dealers. We have estimated, therefore, that the Library would have realized a net profit of some \$20.00 had the material on this particular list been sold.

Value received

What did we receive in return for this expenditure of man-hours and material?

Quantitatively, the harvest was 23 periodical issues, 4 paper-covered monographs in series, and 13 other monographs, some of these also paper-bound.

On the basis of recent bills from a well-known second hand serials dealer, the periodicals and other serial pieces might have cost us a total of \$12.00 had we bought them from him. As for the books (some of them in poor condition indeed), most were library withdrawals of the kind we customarily sell for ten cents apiece at our student book sales. Three or four of the books were in good condition, a few were mildly interest-

ing, out-of-print items, but on the whole they formed a drab lot indeed. An estimated, retail, second-hand price of \$15.00 seems quite generous.

Statistical Summary

Cost of acquiring material	\$ 47.25
Cost of sending out material	122.18
Value lost through not selling	20.00
<hr/>	
Total cost to library	\$189.43
Estimated retail value of material received (generous)	\$ 27.00
<hr/>	
Library's loss over six-month period	\$162.43

Concluding remarks

The hypothesis, long held by all those on the staff who had anything to do with exchange work, that exchanging duplicates in this manner was greatly to our disadvantage, was established beyond cavil. Although the survey was a purely quantitative one and made no pretense to being otherwise, it was obvious that the man-hours and material involved should be withdrawn from this losing venture and invested elsewhere. (The writer is, of course, fully aware that participation in the Duplicates Exchange Union is of considerable value to many types of libraries; his experience in a special library, for instance, showed him that the exchange of duplicates between libraries can indeed be mutually profitable).

The total sum involved was small; a loss of some \$324.00 a year in time and material may seem very little to quibble about in a large acquisition budget. But Dewey's words on this subject have an even greater urgency today than when he wrote them: "Sum of the supremely foolish afekt to despyz ani saving of tym, speciali in tryfls . . . but the total of tryfls makes up most people's waking hours."

MILC PROCESSING PROCEDURES

The development of processing procedures for the Midwest Inter-Library Center is discussed in the current issue of the University of Illinois Library School *Occasional Papers*.

This report was prepared by Velva Jean Osborn, an instructor in library science at Eastern Illinois State College, at the request of the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research of the American Library Association Division of Cataloging and Research. For 16 months Miss Osborn was on the staff of the Center, overseeing the inflow of member deposits. Subsequent to leaving the Center she conducted this survey which is entitled "Early Developments in Storage Library Processing."

Appearing as Number 47 in the *Occasional Papers* series, the report is a preliminary statement of the policies and practices of the member libraries for depositing and shipping materials to MILC.

Copies of this paper will be sent to any individual or institution without charge upon request to the Editor, *Occasional Papers*, University of Illinois Library School, Urbana, Illinois.

Acquisition by Standing Order

WILLIAM B. READY,
*Director, Marquette University Libraries,
Milwaukee, Wisconsin*

LIBRARY resources and technical services are the love and marriage of librarianship; you can't have one without the other. When harmony prevails between them and when without there are cordial and understanding relations with bookselling agencies and other libraries, there will be fruitful and rewarding acquisition, so well ordered and controlled that parties often most at odds—Economy, Efficiency and Expedition—will be in accord.

Many libraries in the past have found that, by the use of already existing agencies, libraries and booksellers, they have been able to acquire books far more satisfactorily than by the usual order methods. The Boston Athenaeum at one time embarked upon a scheme whereby the sister library in Britain, the London Library, supplied it with worthy new British books as they appeared and with lists of other books that it thought might be of interest. These lists served for further orders. Several of our larger research libraries have similar schemes, based on exchange or purchase, with similar libraries overseas. Some of the larger public libraries have greatly lessened the burden of ordering by accepting on blanket approval the publications of certain publishing houses. School libraries are more and more accepting books on approval from supply agencies; and firms of library consultants, who take over acquisition for smaller libraries, are beginning to emerge as a part of the general library pattern.

In the field of the out-of-print work this procedure is even more common. There are many booksellers throughout the world who supply on the basis of standing orders the desiderata of libraries whom they serve. During times of emergency, when books are often the first victims of austerity programs, libraries welcome what they can get from beleaguered countries without going through the traditional process of ordering. This process of ordering can become exceedingly intricate and expensive almost, it would seem, of its own volition. When that volition is added to the proper tendency of order librarians to keep control of their expenditures, a very complicated enterprise can result. The more complicated does that enterprise grow, the more it tends to become tedious and time-consuming. This does not necessarily condemn the enterprise; as a library grows in strength of resources, it naturally follows that the technical processes must grow along with them: strength is rarely commensurate with speed. However, there is a great danger that inertia can set in with strength and growth, and any means that can overcome that malaise in the technical processes needs to be prosecuted,

else it will soon debilitate the library's resources and thereby occasion general calamity.

There is a means of ordering, *Books on Trial*, that is in use at Marquette University Memorial Library that can serve to facilitate the acquisition of books, foreign and domestic, expeditiously, and that may, with modifications, serve to streamline the technical processes. This is the way of it:

There are a number of basic books that the Library is going to acquire. The publication of forthcoming worthy books is as sure as the publication of serials: this is a cardinal fact. Indeed the whole principle behind *Books on Trial* is that a kind of standing order can be placed for books very much in the same way as a standing order is placed for serials. When the books that are received on a standing order are at the same time on approval, a great relief is offered to the technical processes of the library, at the same time strengthening the library's resources. The peculiarity of the *Books on Trial* order procedure is that it is highly selective; the degree of selection must vary with the institution, depending upon its basic books acquisition program.

Marquette Memorial Library serves an undergraduate student body of about 4,000, mainly in the College of Liberal Arts with a growing student enrollment in the burgeoning Science Departments. There is also a rapidly-developing Graduate School; and the schools of Engineering, Law, and Medicine regard the Memorial Library as fulfilling their needs for general cultural requirements. The total enrollment, then, is over 10,000, with 5,000 as prime readers. The average reader use is about 75,000 a month. Marquette thus falls into a frame of reference that includes many other university libraries. There are published overseas annually many books that all the libraries in this frame will acquire, one way or another. Marquette has taken the field of British books, and, using the *Times Literary Supplement* as a marker, has begun to order *Books on Trial* overseas.

The first step in the project is to select a British agent. Fortunately booksellers of probity and acumen are common in the Island, and this is a decision readily made. Marquette chose Bertram Rota, Bookseller of Bodley House, Vigo St., London W. 1, as the library agent. The agent then scans the *TLS* and supplies Marquette with those books under review which from experience he anticipates would eventually have been ordered in the conventional way. They are the kind of books that he and others have been supplying to American libraries for decades. When the *TLS* marker scheme worked out satisfactorily, ordering was increased to envelop all British books of a general learned and popular nature, the news of their forthcoming culled from advance notices. The third category of *Books on Trial* are those lacunae that can exist almost anywhere, and for these there are quotations and messages, never, however, formal orders. The whole process is handled by the Acquisition Librarian.

The method of consignment is a very important part of the operation. The books arrive in parcels, averaging six pounds in weight, book

rate. The agent's label, printed, designates Marquette University Memorial Library as the destination; and a device, in color, readily distinguishes the consignment as *Books on Trial*. The consignment is delivered to the Order room. Each parcel contains its own invoice. Each invoice has a number, thus invoice 3 will list, under author and title, the books that are in the parcel. The invoice checked and filed, the books are taken to the Humanities Reading Room (most of the books are in the humanities). Every month a bill accompanies one of the consignments covering the parcels of the previous month. The bill reads simply: For invoices 1—32—\$X.

The books are displayed on a table adjacent to the service desk, labelled *Books on Trial*. They are processed from that table.

The Order room thus supervises and checks the arrival of the books, maintains the invoice file, and once a month presents the bill, checked against the invoices, for payment. This solves the exchange totting and innumerable little sterling bills of divers dealers. A further refinement deserves consideration: whenever possible, advanced payment is employed just as for serials. Then the invoices all arrive stamped PAID, reimbursement is readily available, and the invoices remain the proof of purchase. The fact that these books arrive as soon or sooner than the *TLS* and other British reviews containing notices about them generally eliminates the keeping of a Books on Order file. The *BNB*, airmail, can serve if necessary as a checklist in this regard.

The cataloging of these books has been accelerated by requiring the agent to send with each book three typed author catalog cards. Correspondence, samples, questions and answers have developed a satisfactory type of card. These cards serve the Humanities Reading Librarian as the basis for full cataloging. The Librarian traces on the back of one card, supplies another to the National Union Catalog, often uses the third as a faculty mailing card. A clerk takes over and occupies three hours a day completing the process. The cards are distributed, after revision, among librarians who include them in the catalog, at the same time advising themselves of recent acquisitions. The average weekly intake of these British *Books on Trial* is about 175. They become part of the library collections within a week of their arrival. The physical preparation (jacketing in plastic, numbering, labelling) is done from the display table at the service desk by librarians and by clerks. The 700 or so books a month received at Marquette in this fashion is a suitable figure, for Marquette. It would vary within each institution, but the procedure is viable in any library. The use of *BNB* catalog cards might further stimulate the process, but since that organization has under consideration the issuance of catalog cards for the use of American libraries, that refinement remains in abeyance.

The acquisition of American trade books as *Books on Trial* is also under way. Here the process is somewhat different. Again, a good library agent must be nominated. Marquette has chosen St. Thomas More Book Shop, 210 W. Madison St., Chicago, as the agent. A knowledge of Mar-

quette is regarded as a necessary background; bookmanship is also essential. Thomas More Book Shop publishes a general literary critical review and is largely a mail order house with a vast public shopping room. The winter and other seasonal lists of the *Publisher's Weekly* and *Books in Print* are the acquiring tools. The *Publisher's Weekly* is checked for forthcoming acquisition, a mate copy is checked for the agent, a copy is supplied to the Order department and one to Cataloging. As the books appear, they are parcelled and invoiced, as are the British books, by the agent. When new orders arrive via departments, the Order department further checks its copy of the *Weekly*, adds them to the standing order, and keeps the Cataloging department copy of the list up to date. The Cataloging department orders LC cards in advance from its list. Other trade books in print are ordered through the same agent as *Books on Trial*, and the *Books in Print* serves as a record in the same places. The monthly presentment of a bill, the payment in advance, and the processing after arrival follow the same pattern save that they proceed *after* cataloging to the display tables where they are finally prepared for the shelves.

This method of ordering has made it possible for two full-time catalogers, with clerical help and the part-time help of the Humanities Librarian, to handle 902 books during the week beginning February 25. The weekly average has stayed above 600.

Marquette is beginning the same process with European books, a slower and more difficult procedure, but well worth investigating because of the value that has accrued from the British and American plans.

The success of *Books on Trial* depends on many things, book budget allocations, the library's history, the quality of the acquisition librarian, among others. The scheme may have some merit for almost any library, great or small, and is therefore here submitted.

A Note On "Command Papers"

WILLIAM H. PATCH,
Memorial Library, University of Wisconsin, Madison

IN November, 1956, Her Majesty's Stationery Office in London issued "Cmdnd. 1," thus continuing the tradition of numbering Command Papers begun by a Select Committee on Printed Papers in 1835.¹ In the Sessional Index for 1836 the first 67 of these papers, beginning with the first reformed Parliament in 1833, were listed with the numbers in brackets to distinguish them from House of Commons Papers. The numbers, however, did not appear on the actual documents until the second series began in 1870. At that time a "C." was added to distinguish them from the earlier set. After the first series it has been the practice to run the numbers to nearly 10,000, breaking off at the end of a

session
the n
T
ident

T
num
than
have

C
alwa
for .

In p
wish

I

It w
of th

Mar

The

Cmd

auth

man

after

myst

the

I

as p

set,

Sessi

Libr

man

This

For

so fa

1. G

xv

2. F

H

3. C

31

session when it became obvious that the limit would be reached during the next session.

The following table shows the five series and their dates with the identifying abbreviations:²

1833-1868-9	[1] to [4222]
1870-1899	[C.1] to [C.9550]
1900-1918	[Cd.1] to [Cd.9239]
1919-1956	[Cmd.1] to Cmd. 9888 (?)
1956-	Cmd.1-

There may be a few numbers published beyond Cmd.9888 since the numbers are assigned at the time of presentation to Parliament rather than when printed. Brackets were dropped during the Cmd. series and have really been superfluous since 1870.

Command Papers derive their name from the following statement, always carried on the title page: "Presented by the Secretary of State for . . . or, Minister of . . . to Parliament by Command of Her Majesty." In practice, the important executive offices use this device when they wish to present information to the Parliament as a whole.

In contents they vary widely in both subject matter and importance. It would be safe to say that few if any are trivial, but a few examples of the most important will suffice: Report of the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce, Cmd. 9678; The Beveridge Report, Cmd. 6404; The Versailles Treaty, Cmd. 153; and the Munich Agreements of 1938, Cmd.5847. I have used the popular titles in describing these as do many authors because of the obscurity of many of the official titles. The Command number is sufficient for certain identification. Two popular terms often used are "blue books" and "white papers." There should be no mystery here; some have blue covers and some white, but at no place on the documents or the official indexes do these words appear.

Libraries which collect all of the Command Papers generally do so as part of their set of British Sessional Papers. To locate them in this set, one must know the session of Parliament and volume number. The Sessional Indexes have a numerical list, but not the cumulations. The Library of Congress has, under *Gt. Brit. Parliament. Papers by Command.*, listed all of them in numerical order to the time of compilation.³ This makes a very convenient short cut to the proper Sessional Index. For a detailed description of all of the Sessional Papers, the best work so far published is the Fords' *Guide to Parliamentary Papers*.

REFERENCES

1. Great Britain. Parliament. House of Commons. British Sessional Papers. 1835 (392) xviii.
2. Ford, Percy and Ford, Grace. *A Guide to Parliamentary Papers; What They Are; How To Find Them; How To Use Them*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1955. 26 p.
3. *Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards Issued to July 31, 1942*. Ann Arbor, Edwards, 1944. (The supplements do not continue this practice.)

Den of the Lone Wolf: A Shop Symposium

"**B**EING a lone wolf cataloger has its drawbacks," Jane Hill once wrote the Editor of the *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*. "How I long to talk shop more often with others."

This is true of us all. The practicing cataloger may read but has little time for (say) the logical ideals of Seymour Lubetzky, the fundamental research of Carlyle Frarey, or the philosophic fluff of Paul Dunkin. Surely there should be also in cataloging literature a place for the earthy details of every day.

Cataloging is not an art but a technique. The cataloger makes a tool, a rather complicated tool. Mr. L. and Mr. F., and the others who work on the purpose and design of the tool may practice an art. But all of the rest of us—we who follow the instructions for building the tool or change them to fit our needs—we are technicians.

We have all heard or read long winded discussions of (1) Librarianship as a profession and (2) What we can do to make it a profession. (Part 2 is a curious appendage which seems to admit that Part 1 is wrong after all! I have little patience with such talk, although I sometimes indulge in it myself.) Often these articles are by teachers in library schools, driven perhaps by the urge to prove that they are just as good as their academic colleagues. Generally "profession" is taken to mean something white collar with a lot of thinking and theoretical study.

That is, indeed, part of the story. But only a minor part. Would the profession (acknowledged by all to be such, I believe) of medicine amount to much if its members did no more than think and study? Most members of the medical profession—and the legal and every other for that matter—are *practitioners*, people skilled in the laboriously acquired techniques of their business. And they spend their time largely practicing those techniques.

Moreover the practice of these techniques in large measure determines the shape and fortune of the profession. Medicine, for instance, is the result of the thinkers and experimenters; it is even more the application of the medicines and care (thought up by the dreamers) in a thousand and one situations in every day life. Law is the result of the thinking and theory of legislators; it is even more the result of common law built up by practice over many years and the result of the techniques used by lawyers and courts to apply the law set up by the thinkers and the dreamers. Freedom is a theory in the Declaration of Independence; it becomes a fact or fails to become a fact in the techniques of the Supreme Court as men like Marshall and Holmes apply them.

We need, I am sure, library schools and teachers who deal heavily in theory and ideals, and we need articles and even entire journals which make us think of theory and ideals.

But that does not change the fact that most of us in the "profession" earn a living only if we get our hands dirty and our minds weary with tiny, technical details.

So we have talked a few busy catalogers into writing down some of the short cuts, labor saving devices, and simplifications (if I may coin a word) which they have worked out and which they think might be of interest to others of the lone wolf fraternity; and I have tried to reduce their comments to fairly uniform summaries.

Please let us know if you like this sort of thing. Even better—and this is the acid test of whether you *really* like it—send along some of your own ideas, and if there are enough we may publish some more some day. The current batch is not limited to cataloging and classification. We hope that future contributions, if there are such, will be from an even broader field—anything, indeed, covered by the vast expanse of those magic letters LRTS.

You might also let us know if you don't like it!—P.S.D.

Janet S. Dickson, Catalog Librarian, Pennsylvania State University Library, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Requests for purchases are made on a form in duplicate, one copy kept by the requesting department. On the other copy the Order department records all searching and bibliographical information, and from it the 7-fold order forms are typed. The form with record of search goes with the book to the Catalog department for assistance to the cataloger, and it then goes with the cataloged book to the department which first requested the book, thus allowing that department to clear its outstanding order file.

Clerical assistants accession books and order and check in LC cards. For some catalogers they search LC catalogs and verify entries for books without LC cards and for serials, and check name and subject authority files. Subject to a cataloger's revision they file in the public catalog, add copies, add volumes, and catalog editions and books with LC cards and no classification problems.

We follow the Lubetzky principles in part when cataloging our own publications. This practice was begun in November 1953, when Pennsylvania State College became Pennsylvania State University and the various Schools became Colleges. All monographs and all serials which have ceased publication are cataloged under the name which the institution bore at the time the publication was issued. All serials which continued after the change are entered under the later name. Subject material has entry under each name in force during the period treated. History cards and references connect the two files.

We treat all editions of American and English fiction as copies, and show variations only on the shelf list cards. Catalog cards give only author, title, and, for titles published during the last ten years, the date. We should like to see the LC limited cataloging rules applied to all materials

except rare books. Cards are multilithed if LC cards are not available and a set of more than six is needed.

Penn State theses are classified by a form number rather than by subject and description is brief. Subject headings are assigned as usual.

Filing is alphabetical with a few exceptions—e.g., periods of history are chronological.

The Central Serial Record, established in 1952, is a visible file record which will eventually list all serials on the campus. It includes acquisitions decisions and cataloging information and will eliminate all other records of holdings. In the catalog all added entries for serials include only the author and/or title with a note referring to the main entry for bibliographical information. Holdings have been eliminated in the catalog for certain groups of serials, e.g., Branch serials, and a note refers the reader to the Periodicals Desk for information.

We record the progress of processing a serial on a Serial Decision form card noting verification, searching, acquisitions and cataloging decisions, indexing information, binding decisions, etc. When the title is finally cataloged and the information transferred to the Serial Record, the card is destroyed. A decision card is also made for each series to be cataloged as separates; later its information is transferred to a permanent card in the Name Authority File. This prevents acquisition of duplicates and duplication in verification.

Our electric pasting machine and "self-filling free-flo" pen for printing call numbers on books are great time savers. For books regularly transferred from the Reading Room to the Stacks when superseded we note the reading room location on a small strip of Mystic Tape attached below the call numbers. The tape is peeled off when the books are sent to the Stacks.

Barbara A. Gates, Head, Technical Services, Public Library, Brookline, Massachusetts.

Originally the order inscription (price, dealer, date of invoice) was written in code on the verso of each title page and on each shelf list card. This, with the copy number, was the official identification for an item. In 1955 we decided to omit the inscription and depend on only the copy number. This saved some time in the Order Department and a great deal in the Catalog Department. The shelf listing assistant can now complete 150 to 200 volumes at one sitting, and shelf listing revision moves much more quickly.

First copies of all books are ordered on approval. They are sent to the Catalog Department with a note of the location of all duplicates. The Catalog Department can then catalog and classify all copies in the system at one time; and when the duplicates are received, cards are ready to be sent with them to the agencies which requested them.

New books are cataloged from LC proofsheets which are then filed until the LC cards arrive. Corrections, if needed, are made on one card for each set from the proofsheets, and the cards then go to the typist.

About three-fourths of all books received are ready for public use within a week or ten days. Because of this and our weekly list of accessions, which is available to the public, we do little temporary cataloging.

Adult fiction receives brief cataloging: author, title and, if known without searching, the date the book first appeared. We catalog other adult items rather fully, using LC cards for about 85 percent, adapted to the books in hand. For books without LC cards, "no conflict" entries apply.

For a juvenile title all cards have author, title, illustrator, edition, publisher, date, and series note; but no collation and few notes.

We do no analyzing, depending chiefly on the indexes.

Mrs. Jane M. Hill, Head, Catalog Department, Public Library, Richmond, Virginia.

All fiction is cataloged under the name on the title page. It is thus unnecessary to record changes on the title page and the spine of the book, and books can circulate freely in their colorful jackets protected by plastic covers. For an author with several pseudonyms there are cross references from each to all. Cards are brief, omitting size.

Beside our fiction shelf list are two alphabetical files of completed order cards (with call numbers added) for non-fiction, one adult and one juvenile. They serve as an index to the non-fiction shelf list and as an authority file, and they speed the cataloging of duplicates, new editions, and continuations.

Current periodicals do not appear in the public catalog; but there are records in the Reference and Periodicals Department, and a shelf list showing bound volumes in the Catalog Department.

For a public library of our size (we serve a population of 230,000) I question the need of added entries for joint author, joint editor, (in most cases) illustrator, and very general subject headings and such subjects as U. S.—HISTORY, AMERICAN POETRY (COLLECTIONS), SCIENCE, and ART. But our staff members serving the public rely heavily on title cards, and I am amazed that so often title entries are not indicated in tracings on printed cards.

We use the alphabetical order of the ALA filing rules, but with chronological arrangement for such subjects as U. S.—HISTORY. Forenames, hyphenated names, and titles are interfiled with subjects, and commas and dashes are disregarded.

Lela M. Jenewein, Asst. Librarian and Head Cataloger, Carnegie Free Library, Tucson, Arizona.

We have eliminated the accessions book. Copy number, date of cataloging, source, and price are typed on the shelf list card.

For all non-fiction we use LC cards, but we often reduce the number of subject headings, and we sometimes change them for juvenile books. If LC cards are not available we type cards, using brief notes if necessary.

We try to keep the DC classification numbers down to two or three digits after the decimal point, and we do not use Cutter figures for fiction. The order card serves as a process slip.

Alfred R. Kraig, Librarian, Public Library, Renton, Washington.

In general we follow Akers' *Simple Library Cataloging*.

For author entry we use the name as it appears on the title page, filling in initials, parenthetical names, dates, etc., from CBI. Title is as it appears on the title page, including references to foreword, preface, or other introductory matter, but not to illustrations. The publisher is given as in Akers' list, with place only if the publisher is not in the list.

Collation consists of the number of pages and, when needed, "illus." for any kind of illustration. Unpaged books are described as "not paged". Series note follows collation. Notes are few and as simple as possible.

In ordering, we mark review publications with the number of copies needed and the purchasing source to be used. Order cards are typed from these reviews, including purchase source and price. When the book is received, the order card is filled out with author's full name, series note, other notes, call number, subject headings, and accessions numbers of all copies. The card is then used as copy in typing cards for the book; after this it becomes the permanent shelf list card. We keep no accession book.

Lillian Norwood, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.

We make our own catalog cards and we include on them only what we think will make a difference in interpreting their content with ease.

We omit italics, *i.e.*, typed underlining, for words such as bishop, saint, or duke, used in apposition after a name. We omit brackets in most cases and we question their need with date, edition statement, place of imprint, and author's name if that information appears somewhere in the book. We seldom indicate an omission.

Generally we use only the term "illus." for illustrations, we do not repeat the author's name in the title transcription, we do not search for the author's dates, and we do not give the size of the book unless it is exceptional. We note a bibliography only if it is two pages long or more, we often omit contents notes, and we list the titles of volumes in a set only on the shelf list and main entry cards with cross reference on all added entry cards to the main entry for this information.

Our series authority file has saved much time and confusion. There is no accession record; we keep only a record of the total number of books cataloged month by month. The Acquisitions and Catalog departments cooperate in establishing personal and corporate name entries, and they share an authority file for names which need cross references.

We use fewer subject headings than are on LC cards and we favor more specific terms.

Short Cuts in Processing at the Public Library of Des Moines, Iowa

CLARIBEL SOMMERVILLE,
Coordinator of Technical Processes

THE technical processes of the Public Library of Des Moines are divided among three departments: Order, Catalog, and Bindery. The Coordinator of Technical Processes is also Head of the Catalog department and supervises closely the work of the Order Clerk. The work of the Order and Catalog departments is so interdependent that it is difficult to draw a clear line of distinction between the specific functions of each.

The Order department places orders approved for the Library's collection (books, pamphlets, periodicals, music, records, microfilm, microcards, etc.). Our book budget for the year 1957 is \$57,500.

The Catalog department adds an average of 23,000 books annually to our present collection of 285,000 volumes; and three professional catalogers and five clerk-typists classify, catalog, shelf list, paste and label these books. In addition to the main catalog, seven branch and two departmental catalogs plus three departmental shelf lists are prepared. All withdrawing from the shelf lists and pulling of cards from the main catalog is done by the Catalog department.

The multiple order form illustrates how closely the Order and Catalog departments are related. The first slip of the form becomes the cataloging slip. It contains the departmental assignments, list price, cost, source, and the call number if the book is a duplicate. This slip is placed in the book as soon as the invoice is cleared, follows the book through the Catalog department, and is returned to the Order department when the book and catalog cards are revised. Then the "In Process" slip is pulled and both slips are destroyed.

Acquisitions

The selection of books for the Library is the responsibility of all professional members of the staff. When their suggestions have been approved by the Director, the orders are placed by the Order Clerk. One copy is purchased initially. When these first copies arrive in the Order department, and before they are processed by the Catalog department, they are examined by the Coordinator of Home Reading. Titles which are possible branch items are placed on "branch examination" where the Branch librarians examine them and decide which they want to duplicate in their particular branches. As soon as the books are released from "branch examination" (one week), they are sent to the Catalog department.

Cataloging

LC cards are ordered for single volumes (non-fiction) purchased for the main library only. Cards for single copies of new novels are typed. When titles are being ordered for branches, the cards are duplicated by means of an American Multigraph Co., no. 60, machine. With the aid of LC proofsheets, the *A.L.A. Booklist*, and the LC catalog, catalogers classify and catalog the books so that cards can be duplicated immediately. Since this work is carried on while the books are on order, they may be processed as soon as they arrive.

A "printing slip" is made out when copies of a title are being ordered for branches. It carries both the sample copy of the card to be printed and the directions for the typist. In order to economize in purchasing card stock, first grade cards are used for the main library only, and second grade cards are used in branches. Having the cards ready when the multiple copies arrive is a great help in getting the books to the various branches and departments without delay.

The unit card is used throughout the system, and we print the call number on the card, thus saving on subsequent typing and revising. Printing the call number was begun in the fall of 1953 at which time we discontinued red call numbers.

We use the following short cuts in descriptive cataloging: (1) We no longer use brackets or the three dots. (2) In the imprint, place is omitted. We use a brief form of the publisher's name, and the latest copyright date. (In a public library, where books are replaced frequently, it is simpler to use the copyright date than the printing date.) (3) Collation is omitted entirely. (4) Bibliography note is made only when the bibliography is the outstanding feature of the book being cataloged.

Example:

370.973	Knight, Edgar Wallace, 1885-
K	Education in the United States. 3rd rev ed. Ginn, c1951.

In cataloging primers, readers, and Boy Scout merit badge pamphlets, which are re-copyrighted often, no date is put on the catalog cards. The copyright date is typed on the shelf list card beside the accession number. Thus, when new editions are added, the catalog cards need not be changed.

In 1951 new catalog cases were purchased for the Main Library. Instead of numbers we use colored labels to distinguish the various rows of trays. (For example, the top row has buff labels, the second row aqua, the third pink, etc.) These have been successful in keeping the drawers in proper order.

It was formerly our practice to classify books and file temporary author and title slips in the catalog. This resulted in problems. In some cases, cataloging was postponed indefinitely; in other cases, temporary slips remained in the catalog even after permanent cards were prepared. (Incorrect temporary entries had been used, or unnecessary title slips had

been made.) We no longer catalog a book on temporary slips; if no LC cards are available, we prepare our own cards before releasing the book.

Before 1954 LC order slips were typed and, from those slips, an alphabetical list was made and filed in a loose leaf notebook under the date of the order. Now a carbon copy of the original LC slip is typed, dated, and filed alphabetically in an LC order file. This eliminates one typing, and the date on each slip shows how long an order has been outstanding.

We are eliminating series cards from the catalog, and relying upon such books as Baer's *Titles in Series*. No new series cards are made, and old series cards are discarded as the books are withdrawn.

Titles, subjects, and official entries beginning with the word "Des Moines" are arranged together in one alphabetical file, regardless of marks of punctuation.

For example:

Des Moines College
Des Moines—Fire dept.
Des Moines. Grandview Lutheran Church
DES MOINES—HISTORY
Des Moines—Public Safety dept.
The Des Moines Register and Tribune
DES MOINES—TAXATION

Subject Headings

Subject headings are a combination of Library of Congress suggestions and Public Library of Des Moines variations. The same subject headings are used in main library and branch catalogs. We adhere to LC in starting new subjects, but try to avoid too many subdivisions, feeling that a larger number of cards in a single alphabet are more useful than numerous subdivisions with only a few cards under each. Several instances have led us to believe that our staff members, as well as the patrons, make greater use of the cards at the beginning of a given subject and tend to neglect subdivisions which file farther back in the drawer.

We are making a study of cards being withdrawn from the catalog. Sample sets are saved. We have noticed that in the same set some of the entries appear worn and dirty while others have scarcely been touched. The entries under the name of a well known person and under popular subjects generally bear marks of hard use. On the other hand, added entries for joint authors, illustrators, translators, etc., are almost as clean as when they were filed. We hope to make a more complete study of these "dirty cards" to determine which entries in the catalog are apparently the most used.

We seldom make cards for joint authors, illustrators or translators. On the other hand, we rarely omit title cards, for our service departments report that title cards are of great value. Title cards are sometimes added in cases where they have been omitted on the LC proofsheets.

Before 1951 there were separate name and subject authority files in both adult and juvenile fields. The name and subject files were combined so that now there are only two files, one adult and one juvenile.

The following short cuts are used in establishing name entries: (1) author dates are eliminated from all juvenile entries, (2) pseudonyms are used for all juvenile books, (3) more and more pseudonyms are being used for adult fiction, (4) if the name is not found in the LC catalogs or in a local directory, the name found in the book is used. LC proofsheets serve several purposes: (1) the typists use them as a guide in typing cards for fiction, (2) the catalogers mark instructions for the typist on the proofsheets for non-fiction, and (3) they are used as name slips and filed in the authority files both adult and juvenile.

Classification and Cutter Numbers

We use a combination of the 14th and 15th editions of Dewey in addition to a few numbers peculiar to this Library, which have been in use for many years. The length of the number depends somewhat upon the quantity of books on the subject that have already been cataloged, but, generally, a basic number is much better for our purposes than an extremely detailed one.

For Main Children's Room, the seven branches, and a Stations department that includes two bookmobiles we use no Cutter number. The Dewey number plus the first letter of the author's last name is used. This system has been used in these units for approximately 20 years. For the main library adult collections we do use a Cutter *Three-figure Alfabetic-Order Table*. About a year ago the Catalog department proposed that the system for the main library be simplified in the same manner as the branches, but the Reference and Circulation departments were reluctant to make such a decision at that time and the matter has not come up again for consideration.

Shelf Lists

In the summer of 1951 we refiled 31 separate shelf lists into two: one adult and one juvenile. The result has been a great saving in the time needed in checking call numbers and in determining how many copies of a book are in the system. The unit card is duplicated for the shelf list. On each shelf list card is typed the cost and source of the book. The accession number is stamped on with the numbering machine at the time the book is accessioned. This eliminates the typing of a six digit number and reduces greatly the chance for error. Symbols used on shelf list cards have been simplified. Two letters (without caps) are used for each department and branch, and for each book dealer.

For example:

ci	Circulation	mc	McClurg
re	Reference	nm	New Method
be	Beaverdale Branch		

We formerly kept a union file of cards which listed holdings in departments and branches with tracings for each book. Combining the shelf lists eliminated the need for this file. Tracings are now typed on the back of the Main Library shelf list cards. This has been helpful in processing

books already in the Main Library, but going to the branches and stations for the first time. The shelf list card is used by the typist as a sample, and the added entries are at hand when needed.

Post-Cataloging

The "old fashioned" accession record was eliminated in 1950 but was resumed in 1953 when an audio charging system was installed. In each loan the clerk at the check-out desk records orally the accession number of the books as well as the transaction number and the patron's name and address. The accession number is used because patrons objected to having authors and titles of books they had selected read aloud. It became necessary for us to keep a brief accession record: accession number, author, title and list price. Cost and source of the book are available from the shelf list. Books are accessioned after they are cataloged and after the catalog cards, book pockets, shelf lists, etc., have been typed. One revision covers all phases of book processing.

The following stampings have been eliminated since 1951: (1) public library stamp on the last page of the book, (2) duplicate accession stamp on page 25, and (3) library property stamp on page 66. Perforating the title page was eliminated in 1953. "Public Library of Des Moines" is now stamped on the top edge of the book; this identifies the book easily, serves as an advertising feature, and is much faster than perforating. We do not mark source and price in the book, and we do not collate. For years, the call number was penciled in the book on the page following the title page. In 1952 this was eliminated and so far no one has missed it. In the summer of 1953 a new process was added. A paper strip carrying the Library's identification is placed inside the "plasti-kleer" jackets. Strips are white except in the case of two special collections, Parents and Browsing, where specific colors are used. The call number is typed on these strips. This eliminates hand marking each book. The strip is revised at the same time as the catalog cards, the shelf list, etc.

Any Reference book which requires labeling is hand-lettered with the stylus. However, certain types of Reference books have proved to be just as useful without labels. For example, we no longer label: atlases (all large ones), *Current Biography*, *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and other similar sets, Moody's manuals, *Readers' Guide*, and *U. S. Code of Federal Regulations*.

All withdrawals are counted with a numbering machine. This is helpful in keeping an accurate count and easily identifies the book card and/or pocket being withdrawn. Before 1950 withdrawals were counted by class; this was time-consuming and the information was never used. Withdrawals are no longer marked in the accession record. This has saved hours of time spent filing book cards in accession order and in marking the accession record with the proper symbols. For years the shelf list card of each book withdrawn was dated and filed in the Last Copy File; in 1952 this file was discarded, also saving hours of filing time. We have failed only a few times in solving withdrawal problems that might have been answered by such a file.

The monthly report for the Catalog department has been greatly simplified. The number of books processed during the month is found by subtracting the accession number used at the beginning of the month from the number used at the end of the month. A record by classes is kept for new titles only. These are counted once a week from the shelf lists and totaled on the report sheet at the end of the month. Formerly, a record was kept of all the books by classes. The shelf list cards were held in a separate file for one month, and all the new accession numbers on them were counted. This was not only time-consuming, but it also delayed the filing of the shelf list cards. For years this report was typed each month. In 1951 a printed form was devised in which only the totals are given. The form was revised in 1954 to include phonograph records.

Special Collections

Since 1952 the Music department has been greatly expanded. Because it would be impossible to catalog our 50,000 pieces of sheet music, a policy for handling music materials was developed. All books pertaining to music and composers, all complete scores for operas, operettas, and all librettos are completely cataloged; but individual selections of sheet music are filed in a vertical filing cabinet. Medium of composition is the main entry and, under each medium, the music is subdivided alphabetically by composer. In a short time it was possible to sort, arrange, and file this music. So far this has proved to be a very workable arrangement and we have been able to keep our backlog at a minimum.

So that patrons will realize that we have an extensive collection of uncataloged music, the following type of card has been placed in the catalog for each composer:

Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750

Some scores by this composer are not indexed in this catalog. Consult the librarian in the Music Department.

Formerly we had one catalog for music literature and one catalog for music scores. In 1953 these two catalogs were refiled into one. Some subject headings had to be changed, but after four years' use everyone agrees that it is much better to have all music in one catalog. We duplicate our own catalog cards for records if no LC cards are available. We have cataloged 1,190 circulating records for this collection, which was started in April, 1954. Cards for phonodiscs are interfiled with other entries in the Music department catalog. In addition, a duplicate set of cards is filed in the Main Catalog. We have some difficulties in adjusting subject headings, but feel that patrons and staff appreciate having the cards in the Main Catalog.

In November, 1952, our Art department was dissolved and all books (about 1,000) of a specialized or scholarly nature having greatest appeal to the student and patron of art were transferred to the Des Moines Art Center Library, which is not a part of the Public Library. Art books

of a popular nature and books on interior decoration and house planning were transferred to our regular Reference or Circulation departments. The Art Catalog was dismantled, and a new one, plus a shelf list, was made for the Art Center Library. All cards for books transferred to the Art Center Library were pulled from the Main Catalog. A shelf list, filed alphabetically by author, is kept in the last drawer of the Main Catalog. This file has been of great help in locating a specific book that a patron may have used when it was in the old Art Department.

When a copy of a particular book is shelved in the Browsing Room, triangular blue cards are inserted in the catalog, one in front of each card of the set. Since this is a fluctuating collection, the Circulation Department takes charge of selecting books and filing the triangular cards. Thus the Catalog department is relieved of the task of pulling, marking, and refiling cards to indicate location of the books.

Special Materials

All pamphlets are ordered by the Order division; those for Branches and the Parents' Collection are assigned subject headings in the Catalog department. (Reference assigns its own subject headings.) Using the *Vertical File Index* as a basic list, a central subject heading file is maintained in the Catalog department so that we can tell which branches have material and folders for each specific subject. All vertical file folders are prepared here. We use gummed labels (from Bro-Dart) on which subject headings are typed. This saves many hours formerly necessary when labels were printed by hand. In addition to identification marks and subject heading labels, each pamphlet is stamped with the date as it is added to the collection. This is an aid in keeping the file up-to-date.

All bound periodicals are accessioned and shelf listed, but no catalog cards are made. The shelf list is housed in the Reference department and serves as the official record for periodicals. Special forms were duplicated for periodical shelf lists.

Projects of the Department

Most of these short cuts and time savers have been inaugurated during the past five years. The time saved has allowed us to begin several time-consuming projects, some of which have been completed.

In 1952 a new scheme for ordering was developed using new forms and the multiple order form. In the fall of that year some 3,000 books for young people were classified and arranged in a Reader Interest grouping. All books were covered with plastic jackets using either the original jackets or hand lettered inserts.

In 1953 a collection of books for parents was developed and a Reader Interest classification was set up. Some books were purchased especially for this collection, others were transferred from other departments. Plastic jackets were put on these books. Pamphlets, also grouped according to the Reader Interest subject headings, were placed in boxes and shelved with the books on these same topics. At the time, all catalog cards for books in the Parents Room were filed in the main catalog.

After three years of service, the librarians in charge of the collection asked for an additional author and title catalog, which has now been prepared. Another category, Family Reading, was added to the Parents Room during the winter of 1956. Books suitable for family enjoyment and which are fun to read aloud comprise the core of this group.

During the past three years, in addition to the average yearly withdrawals (approximately 20,000) a backlog of some 60,000 withdrawals has been completed.

In the spring of 1954 pamphlet files for all seven branches were re-organized. Out-of-date pamphlets were discarded, a subject heading file was developed, and vertical file folders made. When the pamphlets were returned to the branches, the file was ready for use.

In the fall of 1954 the Technical Processes were moved into larger quarters on the second floor of the library. Much time was spent in studying time and motion activities so that furniture and equipment could be placed to the best advantage.

During the spring of 1955 all short story collections in the Reference department were transferred to the Circulation department. All author and title analytics for those books which are in the *Short Story Index* were discarded.

In 1955 all Boy Scout Merit Badge Pamphlets were checked for accuracy and up-to-dateness with our local Boy Scout office. Out-of-date titles were discarded and replaced with new editions. Previously these items had been handled as pamphlets, with subject cards in the Boys and Girls department catalog, but no other entries. As the books were re-examined, they were cataloged. The cards are brief, but it is now possible to locate the titles by author, title, or subject.

During 1955 and 1956 we concentrated on branch library catalogs. They were in a sad state. Normally, branch librarians file and withdraw their own catalog cards. They were so far behind that an assistant from the Catalog department was sent to the various branches to help with the problems. However, the problems became too involved, the filing was inaccurate, and there were so many stray cards, that we decided to revise each catalog. To date, 6 of the 7 branch catalogs have been revised, and we have completed revision of nearly one-third of the catalog in the main Children's Room.

Two special projects begun in 1956 were necessary because of our audio-charging system. In the first place, the elimination of the accession record backfired. The accession book is not necessary for any Catalog department records, but it is needed by the Registration department in sending overdue notices. When the Library began using the audio-charging system, book cards were pulled from all books in the circulating collections and arranged by accession number. For more than 6 months we have been typing a brief accession record from the book cards. When the record is completed, the book cards will be destroyed. Administrators and catalogers should consider carefully the possibility of changes in the charging system before discarding any Catalog department records.

In the second place, with our audio-charging system we loan books for 28 days. In order to be able to loan Christmas books for 7 or 14 days, it was necessary to transfer them to the Reference department where they could be charged out by means of book cards. During the summer of 1956 we gathered together all of the Christmas material. Some of it was discarded, new copies were ordered to replace worn ones, and additional titles were added to make a more complete collection. Missing copies were searched for and all items not located have now been withdrawn as lost. During this process most of the books were recataloged and many subject headings were reevaluated and changed. In addition, the books were improved physically by the use of plastic jackets. Either the original book jacket or Christmas wrapping paper of various designs and colors was used as an insert in the plastic jacket. The entire process was handled by the Catalog department. This subject area is now not only accurate and useable, but also very attractive.

In addition to the Christmas project, all Shakespeare items were examined and new book numbers assigned according to Barden's scheme. We previously had a hodge-podge collection of book numbers, several schemes having been used. As part of the project, some worn books were discarded, new copies were ordered, and many were recataloged. A set of conventional titles similar to the conventional titles used in music scores was established. For example: All copies of *Hamlet* will have *Hamlet* as a conventional title regardless of the wording on the title page.

Earlier in this paper we mentioned the close of the library's Art department, the movement of some books to the Des Moines Art Center, and the transfer of all other art books to the Circulation or Reference departments. There was, of course, some confusion. Last year the Catalog department began a complete inventory of the 700's with the exception of the 780's (our Music department). After searching for a year, all books not located have been withdrawn as lost, and catalog cards are being pulled from the Main catalog. From a total of some 8,000 volumes about 700 have been withdrawn as lost.

At the present moment we are attempting to locate books assigned to an "Extension Collection" some twenty years ago. No new books have been added to this collection since 1940, yet we still have books and shelf lists which we are trying to bring together. When the books are found, if they are still useful, they are transferred to a permanent collection. If not, they are withdrawn. The same procedure is followed in the case of numerous copy books which were added to the Library in previous years without being accessioned or cataloged.

And, there are more. We have started several other projects which are still far from completion. We are working on a file for continuations and we are trying to develop a more complete file of periodical holdings. A policy and procedure manual is still in the preliminary stage. No matter how much time is saved, there is never enough time to complete all the projects we have in mind.

Time and Motion Techniques Related to Costs of Expanding the Card Catalog

Thera P. Cavender,
*Head of Catalog Department,
State University of Iowa, Iowa City*

THE rapid growth of card catalogs in most large university libraries inevitably brings up the problem of expanding the catalog. Techniques for such an expansion at Columbia University Libraries¹ and a report on costs at Duke University² are available in library literature. This account reports an attempt to add to those techniques some principles of time and motion to speed up the process and to reduce the cost.

In general, the problem of the central public catalog at the State University of Iowa was not unusual. Cards from 1680 trays were to be expanded into 1920 trays, a move involving approximately 1,640,000 cards. One minor complication was the fact that the trays in nine of the sections were shorter than the standard length of the other sections, and that these sections were not all in one area, but were scattered among the others.

The original decision to make the move during the summer recess had to be abandoned when the new sections did not come until after the beginning of the fall semester. The creation of a departmental music library and the filing in the central catalog of all the music cards that had previously been in a separate section made it imperative to shift as soon as possible, so it was decided to make the change at Thanksgiving. Since school dismissed at noon on Wednesday, the operation could begin Wednesday morning. It was necessary, then, to plan the preliminary work for as little interruption of the regular work in the Catalog Department as possible, and to have the actual shift so well organized that it would move quickly and smoothly to completion in a limited time.

Decisions to meet those requirements were quite simple: (1) mark in advance where the tray divisions were to be made; (2) have labels typed in advance; (3) make a maximum use of clerical help; (4) work out routines of movement for a fast easy flow of work with as little lost motion as possible.

Preliminary Work

Preliminary work involved the usual checking of supplies. Permanent numbers were added to the new sections so the catalog trays numbered consecutively from one through 1920. Cards to be used to mark the divisions in the trays were numbered also one through 1920. These cards were a color easily seen, were wide enough for the number at the top to be seen above the catalog cards in the tray, and were cut out to fit over the

rod so they could be inserted and adjusted without removing the rod. The cards were numbered with an accessioning machine. This machine was also used to list the tray numbers in consecutive order on sheets of paper for the label supervisor.

The measuring of the cards in the catalog was done by a graduate assistant and one clerk working as a team, one to measure, one to record the numbers. With a little attention to movements in handling the trays, a team can measure a section of sixty trays in ten minutes. It took about five hours to measure twenty-eight sections, 1680 trays.

The uneven measurements of the catalog trays necessitated a percentage estimate of space to be used. A card stock needing 61% of the available space resulted in a calculation of nine inches of cards in the long trays, seven and one-half inches in the short trays. The numbered card divider for the first tray in each section was marked with the inches allowed for the trays in that section. It was most important to have this size marked in advance on the cards, for had the space been allotted by the number on the tray, the measurements would have been out of line when the cards were shifted.

The most crucial part of the whole procedure was the placing of the card dividers in the trays. When they are in place, with no error, the shift becomes a mechanical process that can be carried out completely with clerical help and one supervisor. The process becomes then a study of time and motion.

Placing the card dividers in the trays can be done by two clerks. It is, however, a slower operation than the first measuring for bulk only. Sections of sixty trays required fifteen minutes. The work can proceed as fast as one person can measure. By working on a tall truck, the measurer need waste no time in any other motion. The assistant puts in the numbered cards and handles the trays. By keeping one tray ahead on the truck, bringing down a tray as he puts the completed one back, the assistant keeps an even flow of work and the truck moves with the work.

Though the calculations may seem to be exact, there are possibilities for error in this routine. It is most helpful to have the same person do all the measuring. A "long" measure of an extra quarter of an inch a tray adds fifteen inches to a section. A habitual "long" measure can be disastrous if one expects to come out even at the end. If adjustments have to be made, great care must be taken to keep numbered card dividers in exact order with no spaces missed. The success of the whole operation depends on this phase of the work being entirely correct.

As soon as possible after the card dividers are in place, the label supervisor should begin her listing of labels. This should be completed before the catalog is shifted for three reasons: (1) the labels should be ready when the shift is made to reduce to a minimum the disturbance to users of the catalog; (2) adjustments in the measuring have to be made for breaks at convenient and logical points; (3) if there is any error in numbered cards, it will be detected in time for easy correction. Labels can be inserted in advance in the new sections.

On the day before the shift was to begin, clerks and students removed the guard cards at the front and back of each tray and the direction cards on how to use the catalog. The work was scattered among several people so their regular duties were not entirely disrupted and the work was staggered so that too many were not at the catalog at one time. Rods were withdrawn at this time from the new sections that had as yet no cards.

On the morning of the shift, the supervisor and five clerks who were to help in the shift removed the rods and old labels from the area where the operation was to begin. Each person did one section of sixty trays, placing the rods of each section on top where they would be ready to go back as soon as the follow-up work could start. The first team was then ready to start the shift, while the others continued withdrawing rods and labels.

Shifting the Catalog Cards

Trays of cards to be transferred were loaded on a truck and wheeled in front of the area where they were to be placed. Two people worked on a team. One person sat at a typing table in front of the empty section and did nothing but lift cards from one tray to another, being careful always that the number on the card divider going in the front corresponded with the number on the outside of the tray. The other person handled the trays, keeping one full tray and one empty tray extra on the typing table at all times so the person shifting never had to wait.

Before one truck of trays was emptied, a replacement truck of the next trays in consecutive order was waiting beside the first. As soon as the first emptied trays were returned to their place, a second team of two workers was ready to start shifting into the area left vacant. One extra person kept a reserve truck always loaded for each team, putting the empty trays back in place as trucks were released. Between loadings she had time to continue withdrawing rods and old labels. When the last tray of one section was transferred, the supervisor had ready the first tray of the next area to be done.

Within two hours, 480 trays had been transferred; 1720 were done the first day; and the entire transfer of cards into 1920 trays had been completed by 9:30 of the second day, the Friday after Thanksgiving.

The physical work of the assistant handling the trays was the hardest, so teams reversed their positions from time to time. Some replacements were used to vary the work, the extra people putting in time adding rods and guard cards to the completed sections. The handling of the trays can easily be done by pages or student assistants, preferably boys. The only professional help actually needed for a move of this kind is the planning and supervision of the operation as a whole and the supervision of the labels.

By starting new teams progressively as sections are emptied, one can use as many teams as the space allows. Only two teams were used at Iowa because a 240 tray addition put the teams too close together for adequate working space for more. As the work proceeded back by sections toward the beginning of the catalog, the teams came progressively closer together,

and eventually the trucks had to be abandoned for lack of space. The same procedure worked all the way through, however, by discarding the typing table and using a tall table directly in front of the empty cabinets when the trucks could no longer be used.

New labels were inserted as sections were completed. The use of the catalog was at a minimum because of the Thanksgiving recess, but patrons were able to find what they wanted or were directed to the proper place since none of the trays were outside the catalog area.

Cost

No effort was made to formulate a cost accounting. Estimates have to be made on so many varying conditions that quotations of figures can be misleading. Salaries of both professional and non-professional staff vary in different institutions. The amount of planning that a supervisor does on free time is not always included in accounting. The size of the staff available for the work and the proportion of personnel in different categories is a limiting factor. If an adequate number of pages or student assistants working on an hourly basis is available, the cost may be greatly reduced. If such help is not available, more full-time clerical assistants must be used. If their number is not adequate, the use of professionals expands the total cost.

The timing also affects the cost. This is particularly true of the measuring operation in getting the card dividers in place. If the proportion does not work out exactly as planned or errors have to be corrected, the time spent rises to a maximum rather than a minimum figure.

At Iowa the first card measuring was on Tuesday, the week before Thanksgiving. The placing of the numbered cards was done on the following Friday and Saturday morning. The next Monday and Tuesday were left for the labeling work and whatever adjustment in numbered cards was needed. The shift of cards was made on Wednesday and Friday morning. The labeling was finished Friday except for some trays that did not fit the regulation size which were delayed until Monday. All libraries do not have to cope with such variations in size. For those that do, any failure to account for the location of the irregular sections is costly in every phase of the operation.

In our limited time, it was necessary to eliminate some tasks that would have slowed up the move and prolonged confusion in the catalog area. The repairing of old trays, except in the most critical cases, was held over for a holiday recess at Christmas. No effort was made to check guide cards, which need enough work to require a separate project. In assigning labels, no attempt was made to revise the filing in some areas where it is needed, to revise the contents of the catalog itself, or to estimate areas obsolete or currently popular. At present we feel that a systematic process of catalog revision and change over the next few years will make many changes in our catalog which cannot be adequately measured at this time. Since some of those changes have been decided but not yet fully implemented, and others are under consideration, it

was felt that it would not be worth while now to make any extended study or to make changes that might not be valid later.

Library practices are often individual and specific for a given situation. Some of the procedures we used at Iowa are well-known and generally used. We attempted to use those techniques from current practice that fitted our needs and to improvise where we could improve the effectiveness for our objectives. Our results seem to indicate that organized and careful preparation in advance saves time, allows a more judicious use of personnel, reduces the cost, and decreases the stress of the operation.

Summary

To summarize, the steps in the shift process were (1) number the card dividers and number a list to record labels with an accessioning machine; (2) establish a routine of time and motion for measuring the total bulk of cards, allowing about ten minutes for sixty trays; (3) figure carefully before placing the card dividers to avoid errors and adjustments, allowing fifteen minutes for sixty trays; (4) have guard cards, rods and old labels removed by pages working ahead of the people shifting; (5) have the person who shifts do nothing but lift cards from one tray to another, with the second member of the team handling the trays; (6) move trays to be shifted on trucks, with two trucks for each team so there is no break in the flow of work; (7) provide one person for each three or four teams to load and unload trucks; (8) use as many teams as space permits, filling in with extra teams as areas are left vacant where a new team can start; (9) have rods, labels and guard cards replaced as sections are completed; (10) do not delay the work with tasks that need not necessarily be a part of a shift but may be better timed with other routines either before or after the shift.

Advantages of a move of this kind are: (1) professional help is not necessary except for the planning and the supervision; (2) the move is rapid, with a very short period of time for confusion in the catalog area and no disruption of service; (3) the regular work of a catalog department can proceed with a minimum of interruption; (4) the cost is greatly reduced by the short period of time required for the change and the use of professional help only for supervision.

REFERENCES

1. Terry, A. E. "Techniques for Expanding the Card Catalog of a Large Library." *College and Research Libraries*, 13:242-45, 252. July, 1952.
2. Merritt, G. and Fraey, C. J. "Costs of Expanding the Card Catalog of a Large Library." *College and Research Libraries*, 15:87-89. January, 1954.

On Pre-Filing Sorting Methodology

DONALD W. JOHNSON,
*Cataloging Librarian,
University of Portland*

ALPHABETIZING a group of cards preparatory to filing them is at its best irksome and at its worst pure and unadulterated tedium. What is even worse from the point of view of the librarian is that it is expensive of time and space because of the necessity induced by the common alphabetizing procedures of constant sub-division into more and more groups of constantly diminishing size. It is with this thought in mind that the writer began to probe into the possibilities of working with a single group of constant size in the alphabetizing process, if for no other reason than that such a method would be economical of space. As a matter of fact, a system has been devised which is not only economical of space but is, also, faster and more efficient (especially in the sense of "accurate") than its older brother.

The chief reason that present alphabetizing techniques result in ever-smaller groups is that the arranging and ordering is done from the first letter of the word to the last; therefore, if alphabetizing should be begun at the other end of the word, it may become possible to work with the entire group in every sorting. Actually, we may here assert that it is possible to do this. Of course, it is not necessary that one begin at the very end of the word: it is sufficient to begin, say, at the fifth letter and work toward the first letter of the word. The number of sorts required for each job should be determined in advance, the decision being based upon the size and complexity of the group to be sorted.

In other words, a group of cards might be alphabetized according to the fifth letter, and then according to the fourth, the third, the second, and finally the first, in that order, without ever subdividing the group. One problem arises at this point, however, and that is that if the cards are always picked up in the same sequence no alphabetical order will result on an odd number of sorts, because the cards will reverse sequence on each sort, *i.e.*, A, B, C will fall in that order (A first) and then will be picked up as C, B, A. It is, therefore, necessary to reverse the direction of pick-up on alternate sorts. Owing to the fact that one wants to pick them up from A to Z when the sort on the first letter has been completed, we may set the rule that the cards are to be picked up from A to Z when sorting on odd-numbered letters (counting from the first letter of the word) and from Z to A when sorting on even-numbered letters. One other rule must be set forth at this time: cards must always be dealt with one at a time, never as groups having a common characteristic, because it is essential that the process of alphabetic reversal be continuous and be turned to our advantage.

Let us take an example in order to demonstrate this system. Suppose that we have a stack of cards that happens to be in the following (lack of) order:

Mudge, Isadore Gilbert
 Ellis, Elmer
 Victor book of ballets and ballet music
 Brebner, John Bartlet
 Belloc, Hilaire
 Clark, Andrew Hill
 Dimnet, Ernest
 Pillement, Georges
 Bragg, William Lawrence
 Wade, Allan
 Wadler, Arnold Dwight
 Bell, Eric Temple
 Feather, Leonard G.
 Clodd, Edward
 Childs, James Rives
 Schwendener, Norma

Now, we wish to alphabetize these preparatory to filing them into the public catalog, and we have decided that arranging them according to the first five letters (for demonstration; normally on such a small group only three letters would be used), followed by a quick sight-check, will suffice. First, then, we sort them on the fifth letter (where there is no fifth letter, the card will be placed in a stack preceding the A's, and we will call these "blanks"; similarly, we will deal with "blanks" on any and all sorts). Here is the order that will result after they have been picked up from A to Z (an odd-numbered sort):

Bell, Eric Temple
 Wade, Allan
 Childs, James Rives
 Clodd, Edward
 Schwendener, Norma
 Wadler, Arnold Dwight
 Pillement, Georges
 Dimnet, Ernest
 Mudge, Isadore Gilbert
 Bragg, William Lawrence
 Feather, Leonard G.
 Clark, Andrew Hill
 Brebner, John Bartlet
 Belloc, Hilaire
 Victor book of ballets and ballet music
 Ellis, Elmer

Now we sort them on the fourth letter, and the following arrangement is produced after picking them up from Z to A (an even-numbered sort):

Schwendener, Norma
 Victor book of ballets and ballet music
 Feather, Leonard G.
 Clark, Andrew Hill
 Dimnet, Ernest
 Belloc, Hilaire
 Pillement, Georges
 Wadler, Arnold Dwight
 Childs, James Rives
 Bell, Eric Temple
 Ellis, Elmer
 Bragg, William Lawrence
 Mudge, Isadore Gilbert
 Wade, Allan
 Clodd, Edward
 Brebner, John Bartlet

Following the third letter sort (picked up from A to Z):

Bragg, William Lawrence
 Clark, Andrew Hill
 Feather, Leonard G.
 Victor book of ballets and ballet music
 Wade, Allan
 Mudge, Isadore Gilbert
 Wadler, Arnold Dwight
 Brebner, John Bartlet
 Schwendener, Norma
 Childs, James Rives
 Ellis, Elmer
 Bell, Eric Temple
 Pillement, Georges
 Belloc, Hilaire
 Dimnet, Ernest
 Clodd, Edward

Following the second letter sort (picked up from Z to A):

Mudge, Isadore Gilbert
 Brebner, John Bartlet
 Bragg, William Lawrence
 Clodd, Edward
 Ellis, Elmer
 Clark, Andrew Hill
 Dimnet, Ernest
 Pillement, Georges
 Victor book of ballets and ballet music
 Childs, James Rives
 Belloc, Hilaire
 Bell, Eric Temple
 Feather, Leonard G.
 Schwendener, Norma
 Wadler, Arnold Dwight
 Wade, Allan

Following the first letter sort (picked up from A to Z):

Bell, Eric Temple
Belloc, Hilaire
Bragg, William Lawrence
Brebner, John Bartlet
Childs, James Rives
Clark, Andrew Hill
Clodd, Edward
Dimnet, Ernest
Ellis, Elmer
Feather, Leonard G.
Mudge, Isadore Gilbert
Pillement, Georges
Schwendener, Norma
Victor book of ballets and ballet music
Wade, Allan
Wadler, Arnold Dwight

As can be seen, we have arrived at an alphabetical arrangement, because the result of each sort has been preserved on subsequent sorts (glance at the fourth and fifth letters following the fourth letter sort; the third, fourth, and fifth letters following the third letter sort; and the second, third, fourth, and fifth letters following the second letter sort to verify this). With a little practice, this process is considerably faster than the conventional methods, but its virtues become more readily apparent with larger groups. When dealing with a group as small as the one here used for illustrative purposes, it probably would be better to sort in the usual manner, but when there are a large number of cards to be sorted the technique here expounded holds a very decided advantage. The writer has been using this method for five years and, with respect to library sorting, it fails to surpass the usual technique only on subject headings (because sorting on too many letters would be required) and on small groups of cards.

Let us summarize the rules for this technique:

- 1) Determine, from the size and nature of the group of cards to be sorted, how deeply, *i.e.*, on how many letters, the sorting should be done;
- 2) Begin sorting on the last letter of depth;
- 3) In counting from the first letter, count Mc as *three* letters, for it will be filed as Mac;
- 4) Do not combine different letters of the alphabet (such as U and and V, or X, Y, and Z) but treat each separately;
- 5) Handle cards one at a time, dealing from the top of the deck;
- 6) Where no letter exists at a given point, read it as "blank" and place it preceding the A's;
- 7) On odd-numbered sorts, counting from the first letter of the word, pick up the cards from A to Z, but on even-numbered sorts from Z to A;

- 8) When sorting has been completed, sight-check the cards for arrangement beyond the number of letters sorted.

This method is, obviously, economical of space, since there are no partially alphabetized groups to be set aside. In the normal practice, *i.e.*, by ordinary techniques, a group of cards is divided into 26 groups, each of which is then sub-divided into another 26, etc., but here we have only one group with which to deal, never more.

The "backward" sorting technique is, also, faster, precisely because of the one-group feature.

Lastly, "backward" sorting is more accurate because it overcomes any temptation on the part of the sorter to arrange by sound instead of by actual spelling. How many times, for example, does "Smyth" get inter-filed with "Smith" under ordinary conditions? How often do "Brown" and "Browne" become intermingled?

The writer has been well satisfied with this system for five years and has taught it to others. It should be confessed that the usual first reaction of those told of this system has been to doubt the author's mental competence; but after a demonstration in which they, themselves have done the sorting, all have become converts to "backward" sorting. Now that the time has come to "evangelize" the system, therefore, I should like to suggest that you try it, perhaps as a novelty, and determine for yourself how useful it can be in your own operations.

In closing, it should be noted that this system, intended chiefly for alphabetizing, is adaptable and, therefore, its basic principle is equally useful in arranging numbered series or combinations of alphabetic characters and numbers in series. Translated into library terms, this means that the system can be used in preparation for shelf-list filing, whether you use Dewey or LC. Here, too, it is demonstrably superior to conventional sorting methods.

Resources and Technical Services Division

THE Winter issue of *Library Resources and Technical Services* contained a report of the activities of the Organizing Committee for the Resources and Technical Services Division up to the first of January. At this time it seems appropriate to review the activities which have taken place since that time including the action taken by the membership of the Division and its sections at the Midwinter Conference.

The organization of the new Division is now beginning to take shape, and at the present time there are four sections which have been approved by the Organizing Committee subject to ratification by the membership at Kansas City. These are Acquisitions, formed from the former ALA Board on Acquisition of Library Materials; Cataloging and Classification, from the former Division of Cataloging and Classification; Copying Methods, from the ALA Committee on Copying Methods; and Serials, from the

former Serials Round Table. In addition, the former ALA Board on Resources and the ALA Committee on Bookbinding have been transferred to RTSD. These two units will become committees of the new Division. The Executive Board of ALA, upon recommendation of the Committee on Organization, has also transferred to the new Division responsibility hitherto belonging to ALA for representation on the Joint Committee on Government Publications, the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, and the Microcard Committee. The naming of ALA representatives to the Joint Lake Placid Club Education Foundation ALA Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee has been made the responsibility of the Cataloging and Classification Section. Inasmuch as the functions of the ALA Committee on Public Documents were to be dispersed among the appropriate divisions, the Acquisitions Section has formed a Committee on Public Documents which will include members of the Acquisitions Section who are also members of ACRL, the Reference Services Division, or the State Library Agencies Division.

The Division Committee on Committees under the chairmanship of John Dawson presented a report to the Division at the Midwinter Conference. This report recommended the establishment of Division standing committees including the following: Committee on Constitution and Bylaws, Nominating Committee, Conference Program Committee, Elections Committee, Committee on Organization, Editorial Committee, Membership Committee, and Committee on Regional Processing. These committees are now in the process of being organized. The Committee's report also recommended certain sectional committees, a number of which were already well established, especially in the Cataloging and Classification Section. The work of the Committee on Committees will continue until the completion of the organizing process and will include among other things a study of the Statements of Responsibility of the various sections and the major Division committees in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of functions.

The Committee on Constitution and Bylaws under the chairmanship of Benjamin A. Custer presented a draft Constitution for consideration of the membership at Midwinter. Comments and suggestions were received, and due consideration has been given to these in the preparation of a revised draft to be reported to the membership at the Kansas City meeting in order that it may be considered and adopted at Midwinter. Similarly, the various sections have been preparing constitutions which will also be reported at Kansas City. These will be examined by the Division Committee in order that there may be no conflicts.

The Organizing Committee appointed two other committees prior to the Midwinter Conference. One of these, the Nominating Committee, has prepared a slate of candidates for Division offices. The officers elected this Spring will take over direction of the Division's affairs at the Kansas City Conference. The second committee is the Conference Program Committee. This group has been busily engaged in planning a suitable program for RTSD at Kansas City. Assisting in this planning is the former

DCC Committee on Public Relations which will organize a social function to follow the Division program meeting.

At the organizing meeting of the Division at Midwinter the membership present approved the proposal of the Organizing Committee that it be re-formed to include the chairman of each section until an elected Executive Board could take office. Accordingly the present Executive Committee of the Division consists of the following members: Edwin B. Colburn, Chairman; Edwin E. Williams, Vice Chairman; Mrs. Avis G. Zebker, Secretary; Margaret W. Ayrault; Benjamin A. Custer; F. Bernice Field; Jane Ganfield; William R. Hawken; Bella E. Shachtman; and Robert W. Wadsworth. In addition to these, the Editor of *Library Resources and Technical Services*, Esther Piercy, and the Executive Secretary, Mrs. Orcena Mahoney, are ex officio members of the Executive Committee.

While the problems of organization have been prominent during the past few months, the activities and programs have not been neglected. The transformation of the former *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* into the new publication *Library Resources and Technical Services* has been effected under the guidance of Esther Piercy and Carlyle Frarey. The Acquisitions Section has found time to re-evaluate its Reprints Expediting Project and to develop a tentative Code of Fair Practices for Book Dealers and Librarians. The work of the various committees of the Cataloging and Classification Section has also continued, and several of these groups held meetings at Midwinter. Among these were the Catalog Code Revision Committee which met twice to consider basic questions, such as pseudonymous entry and serials cataloging, and the Special Advisory Committee on the Decimal Classification which held four sessions with representatives of the Editorial Office to consider problems arising in the preparation of the new 16th edition. The Section's Policy and Research Committee met with the Section's Executive Board to consider its future function and to discuss studies currently under way including the Catalog Use Study. The Committee on Subject Headings held an open meeting on Friday, February 1, to discuss points which should be included in the Subject Heading Code now being prepared by David J. Haykin of the Library of Congress. At its business meeting the Cataloging and Classification Section adopted a resolution expressing regret for the untimely death of Dorothy Charles and gratitude for her enduring contributions to the library profession.

The Council of Regional Groups held a luncheon meeting on Thursday, January 31. At it the future affiliation and functions of the groups were discussed. The Organizing Committee is recommending to the membership that the Regional Groups will in the future be affiliated with the Resources & Technical Services Division rather than with the Cataloging and Classification Section. However, the extent of a group's program and activities will be left entirely to the group itself. Those which desire to do so may expand to include as many of the Division's fields of interest as they wish. Many of the groups have already done this. Others may wish to

confine their activities to cataloging and classification problems as in the past.

During the Midwinter Conference the Executive Board of ALA approved the appointment of Mrs. Orcena Mahoney as Executive Secretary of RTSD upon recommendation of the Organizing Committee. With the changed nature of the Division and with the establishment of sections the problem of the extent to which the Executive Secretary can assist the various groups within the Division has arisen. A special committee of the Division's Executive Committee, under the chairmanship of Margaret Ayrault, is now engaged in studying this problem and will make recommendations to the Executive Committee at the 1957 Conference.

Shortly before Midwinter, ALA Headquarters reported that the first membership dues returns indicated that the Resources and Technical Services Division would probably have a membership of approximately 4,300 making it the largest type of activity division and the third largest division in ALA. It is the sincere hope of the Executive Committee that we can build an organization which will strengthen each group composing it and at the same time contribute to a more efficient and stronger ALA. The Committee wants all Division members to feel that this is their organization and that it at all times welcomes suggestions concerning the organization and the program of activities in which the Division is currently engaged.—*Edwin B. Colburn, Chairman*

Policy and Research Committee, Cataloging and Classification Section

MINUTES OF MEETINGS,
January 28-29, 1957, Chicago

THE POLICY and Research Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division, formerly designated as the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research of the Division of Cataloging and Classification, held its regular midwinter meeting at the Edgewater Beach Hotel on January 28, 1957, at 8:30 p.m. The meeting was attended by: *Members of the Board:* Katharine Ball, Margaret C. Brown, Bella E. Shachtman, Maurice F. Tauber, and John W. Cronin, Chairman.

The first order of business was the review and discussion of the second draft of the report on the Catalog Use Study, prepared by Sidney L. Jackson and submitted to the Advisory Committee early in January. Incorporated in this draft were many of the comments and suggestions made by members of the Advisory Committee who had had an opportunity to study the first draft. The recommendation was made that all members of the Advisory Committee be asked to submit to Dr.

Jackson in writing their comments on the second draft. The Committee was of the opinion that the draft needed editing in parts and some re-checking of statistical data. Members of the Committee were requested to submit comments in writing to the Chairman who would see that these suggestions were brought to the attention of Dr. Jackson and other members of the Advisory Committee. It was also recommended that a progress report be sent to Mr. Norman Bassett.

Another study of interest to the Committee is that on the Midwest Inter-Library Center, by Velva Jeanne Osborn. It was reported that Miss Osborn's study was scheduled to appear in a forthcoming issue of *Occasional Papers* of the University of Illinois.

The Committee next discussed some current studies related to the application of various devices, mechanical and otherwise, for the retrieval of information. Reference was made to Richard Angell's work in this field and the studies under way at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Western Reserve University's Documentation Center.

This same topic was also the subject of a panel discussion at the December 28-29 meeting in New York of the American Documentation Institute. Members of the panel represented machine designers, as well as those concerned with abstracting, indexing, and library operations. The panelists were Samuel N. Alexander of the National Bureau of Standards, H. Peter Luhn of IBM, John Mauchley of Remington Rand Univac Division, Charles L. Bernier of *Chemical Abstracts*, Richard S. Angell, and Maurice F. Tauber. The last two named presented the traditional methods of analysis used in libraries for the retrieval of information. The consensus of this panel was that, because of the limited knowledge of the ways in which researchers use materials, it is difficult to construct machines to fit library needs. Except in narrow subject fields involving homogeneous material, the variant patterns of research do not lend themselves easily to the codification required by the mechanical devices for retrieving information. The problem is complicated by the failure of librarians to know about potential applications of the machines and the failure of machine designers to understand the peregrinations of researchers or the needs of librarians. On the other hand, information processing is well advanced for the types of data which are at present subject to codification. Attention was called to the recent publication, *Documentation in Action*, edited by J. H. Shera, Allen Kent, and J. W. Perry, of Western Reserve. Mention was made of the Symposium on Systems for Information Retrieval, to be held at Western Reserve University, April 15-17, 1957, and of the International Conference on Classification and Information Retrieval to be held in London, England, on May 12-13, 1957.

The Chairman reported that the studies to be undertaken by John L. Nolan and Estelle Brodman regarding the use of book catalogs as substitutes for card catalogs have been delayed because of the transfer of the National Library of Medicine from the Department of Defense to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the attendant

reorganization problems. It is hoped the studies can be undertaken this spring.

The Chairman had approached Wyllis E. Wright to inquire if it would be possible for the Committee to be kept informed of the progress made on code revision. Mr. Wright replied that copies of progress reports would be sent to each member of the Committee.

Some time ago the Committee discussed the possibility of analyzing the background and qualifications of catalogers listed in *Who's Who in Library Service*, with the view to (1) developing a roster of professionally active catalogers; (2) evaluating cataloging personnel in the United States; and (3) determining the nature of the background and experience of successful catalogers. There now seems little likelihood that such a project could be undertaken in the near future. The Committee also indicated that with the reorganization of ALA this kind of inquiry might fall within the field of interest of the Library Administration Division.

It was reported that the Reverend Oliver Kapsner of the Catholic University of America had asked that the Library of Congress consider the possibility of indicating in *The National Union Catalog* when an entry on copy provided through cooperative cataloging had been changed to conform to Library of Congress policy. Approximately 30% of the entries in *The National Union Catalog* are from other libraries, so this would be a project of impressive proportions. The Committee suggested that a recommendation regarding this proposal be sought from the Committee on Descriptive Cataloging.

The Chairman brought up for Committee reaction a suggestion that there be published, beginning in 1958, a subject index to *The National Union Catalog*. The Committee was asked to consider whether such a publication would be likely to lead to the discarding of subject catalogs in libraries throughout the country and perhaps enable libraries to discard future subject catalogs every five years as cumulations were published. The Committee was asked to come prepared at the next meeting to discuss this question further.

At 10 a.m., on January 29, 1957, the Policy and Research Committee met with the Executive Board of the Cataloging and Classification Section of RTSD. This meeting was an outgrowth of a suggestion made at the Committee's meeting on June 18, 1957, at Miami Beach, Florida, when it was proposed that joint meetings be held with the Executive Board from time to time to give the Executive Board an opportunity to question the Committee about its work.

The first topic for discussion at this first joint meeting was the question of the role of the former Board on Cataloging Policy and Research in the new Resources and Technical Services Division. The Committee on Committees recommended to the Organizing Committee that the Division as a whole have a policy and research committee and that each section of the Division have a similar committee. The consensus of the present Policy and Research Committee of the Cataloging and Classifica-

tion Section was that it should remain an arm of the Executive Board of the Section and that there was little real need, in their opinion, for a policy and research committee attached to the Division proper. It may be as the reorganization develops that not every section will require such a committee. Coordination among such committees attached to individual sections would be imperative, but this could be accomplished informally without creating a committee whose sole responsibility would be coordination. In regard to the initiation of projects, it was emphasized again that all members of the Division or of the Section were invited to recommend projects for the Committee's consideration.

The Executive Board by formal vote recommended that "The Cataloging and Classification Section continue a policy and research committee and that it recommend to the Resources and Technical Services Division Organizing Committee that the need for a Division committee on policy and research be reconsidered, since the potential program of such a Division committee appears to be quite within the province of such Section committees on policy and research as may be established."

The function of the Committee on Policy and Research was discussed in some detail, and it was generally agreed that this Committee should act at the policy level, rather than as an operational body. It should function as an advisory group to the Executive Board, making recommendations for investigations and supplying exploratory information to the Board. The recommendations should include projects which should be undertaken, and the Section committees which should be responsible for carrying out these projects should be suggested. The Committee on Policy and Research should keep in close contact with the committees carrying out the projects, and should act as advisors to them. If a project does not properly fall within the province of any one standing committee, it was agreed that the formation of a special committee might be recommended. It was also agreed that the Executive Board may at any time refer a recommendation back to the Policy and Research Committee for further consideration.

The importance of having annual reports of the standing committees submitted to the Chairman of the Policy and Research Committee was emphasized.

Appointments to the Committee were discussed, with consideration given to the present practice of appointing committee members living within a limited geographical area, because of the need for having two meetings a year, in addition to those at the regular midwinter and annual meetings of the American Library Association. Until it can be learned whether the Section will have travel funds available for these interim meetings, it was considered advisable to continue the present policy of committee appointments.

Members of the Committee expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to meet with the Executive Board and indicated that future meetings, probably at midwinter, would be helpful to the Committee in its work.—Margaret C. Brown, *Reporter*.

REGIONAL GROUPS

The Council of Regional Groups held a luncheon January 31 during the Midwinter Conference for the purpose of discussing reorganization as it affected regional groups. Complete reports have been sent to the Chairman of each Group and will doubtless be discussed in meetings. In the general discussion on the functions of regional groups, the point was again brought out that groups could be the clearing house between individual libraries and Headquarters office for reporting on special projects; so that such information can be made available generally. We are, therefore, making a tentative start on reporting such activities as have been made known to us in a special paragraph at the end of this Regional Groups section. With the reportorial help of each group, we should be able to help each other by making such special projects and studies known.

The fall meeting of the BOSTON REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS AND CLASSIFIERS was held at the New England Library Association Conference at Swampscott on October 5. Seymour Lubetzky, editor of the proposed ALA catalog code, after introductory remarks on the objectives of the new code, threw the meeting open for questions and discussion. He was assisted in answering by Wyllis Wright, Chairman of the Code Revision Committee.

The NORTHERN CALIFORNIA REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS met at Stanford University, October 19. Ruth L. Steinmetz, Cataloger of Cubberley Library, presented a paper prepared jointly with Emily I. Olson, Librarian: "Project under Pressure; a Description of the Stanford University School of Education Curriculum Library." This was a big project, done under pressure and within a limited time, which necessitated establishing many short cuts and simplifications in recording.

The CHICAGO REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS AND CLASSIFIERS met December 3 with John Dawson presiding as Acting Chairman. Mrs. Mahoney discussed reorganization and its implication for regional groups. Gertrude Probst presented amendments to the By-Laws to care for the enlarged scope of the group. Action was deferred until the next meeting on constitutional grounds; but the Chicago Group thus becomes the first regional group officially to prepare to take action to enlarge its scope and become a regional group of the Resources and Technical Services Division. Speaker of the evening was Edward Heiliger, Librarian of the Navy Pier Branch of the University of Illinois, who gave an account of his library adventure and experiences in several Latin American countries.

The CATALOGERS' SECTION of the ILLINOIS LIBRARY ASSOCIATION met in Peoria, October 19. The luncheon business meeting was concluded by a report made by Mrs. Mahoney on news of the Division. At a later meeting, Ruth French Strout, University of Chicago, spoke on "Observations on the New Cataloging Code."

The CATALOG SECTION of the IOWA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION held its annual meeting in Des Moines, October 18. Following the business meeting Agnes Hibbs, Mildred Smock and Gertrude Voelker participated in a panel discussion of possible short cuts in the technical processes.

The CATALOGERS' SECTION of the KANSAS LIBRARY ASSOCIATION met October 12 for a business meeting to discuss constitutional changes and to plan for activities for the Group. This discussion was based on a questionnaire which had been sent to Kansas catalogers to poll them on their desires as to what the functions of the Group should be. It was decided that a committee be appointed to study the mak-

ing of a bibliography of catalogers' basic tools to be sent to libraries across the state.

The fall meeting of the LOS ANGELES REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS was held November 16 in Pasadena. After Esther Koch reported on cataloging activities at the ALA Conference in Miami Beach, York Kroman, consulting psychologist, spoke on "You Like Your Tensions," emphasizing tensions with which the librarian has to struggle.

The MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, AND DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS AND CLASSIFIERS held its 1956 annual meeting in Richmond on November 3. At the end of the business session, Benjamin Custer discussed the reorganization of ALA and DCC. At the afternoon program Jack Dalton spoke on "The American Library School Today."

MIAMI REGIONAL CATALOGERS met October 9. After a progress report on current projects, a Request Committee was appointed to handle requests for aid by small libraries. The program for the evening consisted of a "busman's holiday," members of the Group telling about the libraries they had visited during the summer.

Another meeting was held November 13. A report was made on the project of cataloging the library of the Jewish Home for the Aged, which had been completed. Edward A. Henry gave a talk on "Cataloging—Past, Present and Future."

At a third meeting on January 15, the final report on the project of cataloging the books for the Jewish Home for the Aged was given. The program section of the meeting was devoted to the cataloging of non book materials with the following participants: Music—Carolyn Fletcher; Records—Betty Todd; Microcards, Microfilm—Adele Emery; Manuscripts, Scrapbooks, etc.—Elizabeth Peeler.

The MICHIGAN REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS met in Muskegon, October

25. Virginia Alexander gave a report on the Library Services Act. Margaret Ayrault, CCS Chairman reported on Section activities. The rest of the program was devoted to the training of catalogers. Jesse H. Shera, Dean of the School of Library Science, Western Reserve University, took the position that the training of catalogers, instead of following the present pattern, should reverse itself and begin with the theoretical background, in order to understand the relation of the catalog to the whole bibliographical picture, and then start to concentrate on the minutiae of cataloging. Claxton Helms, Librarian of the Allegan Public Library, representing the administrator, was of the opinion that, although a thorough grounding in history and theory of cataloging and in bibliographical method is essential, more emphasis should be placed on modern labor-saving and time-saving techniques. Dorothy Comins, Head Cataloger of Wayne State University Library, representing the administrator of a scholarly institution, would like to see (1) emphasis on selecting and recruiting students with an aptitude for cataloging and classification positions; (2) a good basic and practical training in cataloging for all students in library schools because of its value in any library position; and (3) more emphasis on the study of the rules for descriptive cataloging. The viewpoint of the recent graduate was presented by LeRoy Ortopan, Pontiac Public Library, who suggested that an apprenticeship program be included in the training of catalogers.

The spring meeting was a joint meeting with the Reference and College Section of the Michigan Library Association to discuss "Regional Processing: the Ideal and the Practical."

The MISSOURI GROUP OF CATALOGERS AND CLASSIFIERS met at Cape Girardeau, October 5. Leo R. Rift, University of Missouri, spoke on "The Girl They Left Behind; Serials and the New Catalog Code."

The NASHVILLE CATALOGERS met November 1, devoting the program to reports on the University of Chicago Graduate Library School Conference and the Southeastern Library Association Conference.

The fall meeting of the CATALOGERS' SECTION of the NEW JERSEY LIBRARY ASSOCIATION was held October 3 at the Donnell Regional Branch of the New York Public Library. After the business meeting, Katherine O'Brien, Superintendent of the Donnell Branch, explained the scope and activities of the branch. This was followed by a tour of the building, with emphasis on the work of the Catalog Department and the Union Catalog, which has been transferred here from the 42nd Street Building.

The NEW YORK REGIONAL CATALOG GROUP has its fall dinner meeting November 30. President Emily C. Nixon spoke briefly on the great loss suffered to the profession and the Group by the death of Dorothy Charles. Among the guests were: Benjamin Custer, Editor, Dewey Decimal Classification, who spoke briefly on his work; Mrs. Mahoney, Executive Secretary of RTSD; and Margaret Ayrault, Chairman of the CCS who spoke of the development of the Section and of reorganization. The speaker of the evening, Jay E. Daily, Librarian, National Conference of Christians and Jews, had as his topic "Subject Headings and the Theory of Classification."

The NORTHERN OHIO CATALOGERS met in October at the new Freiburger Library of Western Reserve University, which houses the University Library, the School of Library Science, and the Cleveland Regional Catalog. Wrayton E. Gardner, Assistant Director of the University Library, spoke on the preliminary plans made three years ago for centralizing all of the libraries of Western Reserve University in the new building. This consolidation presented many problems in variety of classification systems and of

cataloging practice, and also of changing from closed to open stacks. Jesse H. Shera, Dean of the Library School, spoke briefly on the School of Library Science and the Documentation and Communication Research Center.

The OKLAHOMA REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS was host to the catalogers attending the Southwestern Library Association meeting at a luncheon in Oklahoma City, October 12. Ralph Shaw, ALA President, spoke on how to cut waste effort in cataloging, giving as a fundamental guide these words: Do not do efficiently what can be left undone.

The PHILADELPHIA REGIONAL CATALOGERS' GROUP met March 21. Audrey Smith was appointed to investigate the sentiment of the Group towards enlarging the scope to correspond with the reorganized Resources and Technical Services Division. David J. Haykin spoke about his forthcoming book, "Code of Subject Heading Formulation and Application."

The SOUTHEASTERN REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS held its regular biennial meeting at Roanoke on October 12. Mrs. Mahoney spoke on "Activities and Plans of the Division of Cataloging and Classification." John Cook Wyllie, Librarian, Alderman Library, University of Virginia, reported on cooperative cataloging for the Louisville Microcard project. Albert Boni upon invitation discussed the plans for preparing catalog cards for the microprint edition of Evans' titles.

Information Clearing House.—Miami Regional Catalogers have prepared a "Procedures Manual for Small Libraries," copies of which can be purchased through the Group or the Miami Public Library. The Catalog Department of the Library of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas has prepared a mimeographed pamphlet "Rules for Making Title Added Entries."—*Henrietta Howell, Chairman, Council of Regional Groups.*

REVIEWS

Shera, Jesse H., and Egan, Margaret E. *The Classified Catalog, Basic Principles and Practices. With a Code for the Construction and Maintenance of the Classified Catalog*, by Jeannette M. Lynn and Zola Hilton. Chicago, American Library Association, 1956. xi, 130 p. \$4.

The spirit of this review can best be expressed by saying that, with my great admiration for Margaret Mann and my close association with her from 1935 on, I could never look on the classified catalog with anything but sympathy and understanding. How deeply MM was committed to the classified catalog is known to those of us who saw the first draft of the second edition of her *Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books*. Even in the much more moderate statement which eventually was published, her enthusiasm for this type of catalog is apparent. Undoubtedly she would have been pleased to see the Lynn-Hilton code, for in 1943 she said that a new code for the classified catalog was needed. Against this background, then, it can readily be perceived that it goes against the grain to have to review adversely a book on the classified catalog. And since it was necessary to be critical on numerous points, it must be emphasized that the criticism is on all occasions as sympathetic as it is considered.

In general the difficulties do not relate to the second half of the book which concerns itself fully with the central theme. The trouble is with the first half which leaves one very much at a loss both for its failure to take advantage of an obvious opportunity to describe and appraise classified catalogs as they are found in Europe and America today, and for the bypaths it gets into instead. It is these shortcomings which account for the character

and length of this review, since in this country there is so little interest in the classified catalog that a detailed review of such a specialty would not be justified.

At best a book on the classified catalog is something of an anomaly in the United States where that form has never obtained more than the barest toehold. The book came about because the John Crerar Library realized, after half a century of use, that its classified catalog—effective to a high degree—was not entirely a satisfactory instrument. Herman Henkle, Librarian of John Crerar, believed that the classified catalog has important undeveloped potentialities for the organization of library materials; so he secured a Rockefeller Foundation grant and arranged for Dean Shera and Miss Egan, both of Western Reserve School of Library Science, to re-examine the classified catalog in relation to the collections, services, and clientele of the John Crerar Library. The present volume is one part of their findings. Mr. Henkle tells me that what the library gained from the survey was a realization that the pattern of its classified catalog was violating a number of the basic principles for the best construction of such catalogs.

In these circumstances the book could have been developed as a case study of considerable interest, beginning with a presentation both of the shortcomings in the existing catalog and of the undeveloped potentialities, and ending with a prescribed course of action. On the basis of the evidence presented, it would then have been possible for American librarians to make a fresh appraisal of the classified catalog. As things stand, there is not enough data on which to base such a judgment, perhaps in part because the authors do not wish to commit themselves until an extensive program of

research has been carried out (p. 21). Yet obviously more could have been said that would have been of profit to all concerned. For instance, it was not necessary to dismiss the history of the classified catalog in two sentences. As a matter of fact, some attention to its history might have corrected the error (stated baldly by Ranganathan in his *Classified Catalogue Code* and suggested by Shera and Egan on page 3) that libraries exploited the dictionary catalog before they turned to the classified catalog.

We are left to discover from a footnote (p. x) that there are four classified catalogs in the United States: at Boston University, the Engineering Societies Library in New York, the John Crerar Library, and the Science-Technology Department of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. In the text we find that one is being proposed for the National Library of Canada, based on the Library of Congress classification. No mention is made of the classified catalog which the Library of Congress has been at pains to develop in the form of an expanded shelflist; and although the alphabetico-classed catalog is referred to ("Its possibilities have never been adequately explored." p. 13), no reference is made to any application or to the most interesting survival in the American History Division of the New York Public Library. Still further, although the bibliography covers European references, no space is devoted in the text to the extensive German writings on *Sachkatalogisierung*, the arguments that have raged around British classified catalogs, or indeed any foreign ideas or experience. Since half the book is given over to background information, would it not have been desirable to set the stage by giving a historical and critical introduction to the classified catalog as such, listing and describing the types, and characterizing the principal American ones?

Failure to describe existing American classified catalogs has led to a cer-

tain amount of misinformation. For example, on page 62 (cf. pp. 66-7) it is stated that: "Traditionally, in those United States libraries having classified catalogs, the classification system used for the organization of the catalog and that for the classification of the books on the shelves has been the same." One of the most interesting features of the classified catalog Margaret Mann created at the Engineering Societies Library was the employment of detailed UDC numbers for the arrangement of the cards while simple Dewey numbers were assigned to the books themselves. Such a practice is part of the American tradition, insofar as there is one; it might also have been taken into account in the design of a standard card for use in classified catalogs (p. 70), a card which incidentally does not entirely correspond with John Crerar practice, so leaves one wondering for whom it was designed. In any event, might not representative cards from each American classified catalog have illustrated the text admirably and contributed more than a skeleton card does?

In the foreword (p. vii) Mr. Henkle says: "It is not the purpose of this little volume to 'sell' the classified catalog." But the authors have a tendency to try to "sell" the classified catalog when they weight their arguments in favor of the classified catalog instead of weighing matters impartially. For instance, after listing the advantages and disadvantages of the dictionary and classified catalog (pp. 16-21), their conclusion is "that the arguments favoring the classified catalog outnumber those supporting the alphabetical arrangement" (p. 21), an inconsequential finding even when coupled with the partial disclaimer: "this does not necessarily argue for the superiority of the former in all situations." Again, the dictionary catalog is criticized (p. 17) because a true philosophy of subject headings remains to be developed; yet the classified catalog is not criticized in

turn for want of a true philosophy of either classification or the classified catalog itself. On the contrary, the authors express some impatience with those who are inclined "to weigh against the utility of the classified catalog on this score" (p. 23). Then, when the numerical advantages are investigated, one finds that words in a dictionary catalog are "probably" more easily understood (p. 16) than symbols in a classified catalog. Why overplay the classified catalog? Words *are* more easily understood.

Henry Sharpe, in his *Cataloguing, a Textbook for Use in Libraries* (4th ed. London, 1948. p. 23), said that it is necessary to be perfectly fair in comparing the dictionary and classified catalogs. The particular comparison which led him to make this observation was the statement sometimes made that the classified catalog brings together systematically what the dictionary catalog scatters. He gives two illustrations to show instances in which the reverse is true. Similar fairness should have been aimed at in *The Classified Catalog*. On page 19 one of the numerical advantages of the classified catalog is said to be that it "permits easy compilation of bibliographies through reproduction of specified sections of the catalog," an oversimplified statement which implies that the dictionary catalog does not permit "easy" compilation of bibliographies. In actuality both types aid in the compilation of bibliographies, in somewhat different ways to be sure and with varying degrees of effectiveness in individual situations. Again, on page 74, the dictionary catalog is criticized for sending the reader to different places to follow up "see also" references when by contrast the classified catalog has neither "see" nor "see also" references. But is not the index to the classified catalog a vast network of such references? And the statement on page 74 is preceded and followed by examples which show that the reader who con-

sults a classified catalog will likewise be sent to different parts of the catalog for relevant materials. It is true, as stated on page 73, that the classified catalog brings together logically related materials (as Dewey brings together philosophy and logic); but it is equally true that it cannot help scattering logically related materials (as Dewey separates logic and mathematics); and a similar observation can be made about the dictionary catalog.

Although Shera and Egan criticize both types of catalog on the score of obsolescence, their treatment and emphasis could have been different. It should have been pointed out that—by comparison with changes in subject headings—obsolescence is an extremely difficult matter to control in a classification system or in a classified catalog. How can one, for instance, maintain a medical classification in such a way that obsolescence is avoided in major areas such as are represented by the slow, gradual shift in the etiology of diseases? As the shift occurs how can it be recognized and, once recognized, how can it be met in the face of operating costs, staff specialization, work loads, arrearages, and so on? And does one arbitrarily change Dewey, UDC, or the Library of Congress system to meet the challenge? These are interesting theoretical and practical questions worth consideration.

An Excursus into Classification

A third of the book is devoted to a discussion of the principles which underlie the construction of a library classification system. Apparently a number of those who read the manuscript recommended that this chapter be omitted. "The language is sometimes difficult to follow and unnecessarily complex," they said (p. vi). Their recommendation was dismissed on the ground that those who want to read the theory of classification in monosyllables can skip Chapter 2; on the other hand they are told that they will

be better classifiers if they do not skip it. But will they? How many successful workaday classifiers are conversant—or feel any need to be conversant—with the predicables as identified by Aristotle and later modified by Porphyry?

How did a chapter on the lower logical processes in relation to the construction of a classification system find its way into a book on the classified catalog? It is a non sequitur; it does not lead to the conclusion that Dewey, the UDC, or the Library of Congress scheme is best suited to a classified catalog, nor does it recommend the development of a new system specially designed for the classified catalog. It starts off promisingly by saying: "The central factor in the success or failure of a classified catalog is the efficacy of the system of classification upon which the catalog is based" (p. 23). But then, instead of appraising existing systems from the point of view of the classified catalog, the chapter devotes almost twenty pages to the philosophical principles of classification, with special attention to the categories of Aristotle and Kant. If this kind of writing was called for, the authors might have made a real contribution by investigating and expounding the views of Leibniz, the man who stands at the forefront of modern logic, who was, moreover, both a distinguished logician and a distinguished librarian.

Once again one suspects that the authors have seen the problem through the eyes of the John Crerar Library without regard to other libraries which possess classified catalogs. For classification this means that their viewpoint is rather that of Dewey, and the mystifying chapter on classification is a way of expressing wonderment about the effectiveness of a classified catalog based on Dewey. The Decimal Classification is clearly in mind in the following statement (p. 69): "It is the decimal principle that makes possible the intercalation of new terms into the classification without violating the logi-

cal order of the schematism." It is true that the decimal principle is one mode, but there are others such as the alphabetical and the straight numerical which occur in the Library of Congress system in addition to the decimal device.

Supposedly some of the confusion in this chapter comes about because, without expressing it as such, the authors are grappling with the relationship between classification as a system of knowledge, such as the German philosophers loved to play with in the nineteenth century in particular, and classification as an everyday practical library affair. There can be a world of difference between the two; and as far as the classified catalog is concerned the Engineering Societies Library was probably on right lines when it freed its classified catalog from the limitations of the practical library classification it followed for the arrangement of its bookstock. The question one needs to ask is whether there can be a truly effective classified catalog if it is bound to a standard library classification system.

Not an American Form

This review would evade its responsibility if it did not emphasize the fact that the classified catalog has been and should remain a thing apart from the main stream of American library economy. The authors are reading more into the picture than is right and proper when they maintain that "There has been . . . a renewal of interest in the classified catalog and a new burgeoning of enthusiasm for experimentation with new approaches to classification itself" (p. ix). Quite definitely the classified catalog does not belong in a general library in this country; in the one case in which it may be found, namely Boston University, I advised strongly against its inception and would advise against its continuance. In very exceptional cases the classified catalog may belong in a spe-

cial library for the simple reason that a special library ought to follow the methodology most suited to its collection and clientele.

The basic situation is simply this, that in the United States libraries must function efficiently with a maximum of self-service on the part of the reader. As a reader, informed or uninitiated, John Doe should be able to walk into any American library and discover with a minimum of help what books are available on any topic, regardless of whether it can be precisely defined or not: Shakespeare's London, the Californian gold rush, New England transcendentalism, and so on. He would welcome the occasions on which he could go directly to the shelves for his material; he would feel that something of a barrier has been put between him and the books when he was forced to work from a catalog before going to the shelves; but he would be properly concerned if he had to go to an index to the catalog before he could go to the catalog itself. Margaret Mann, this country's greatest proponent of the classified catalog, was fond of saying, in connection with the Engineering Societies Library catalog, that it did not take long for an engineer to learn the number or numbers for his particular specialty; and when needs can be precisely met in this way, obviously the index ceases quickly to be an intermediate step. But comparatively few students or research people can consistently define their interests so narrowly; interdisciplinary exploitation of the bookstock is pretty surely a more common occurrence today than narrow specialization that is self-sufficient within its own prescribed limits—certainly in the humanities and social sciences. And this observation leads to the generalization that the classified catalog is not, and cannot be made, a truly effective tool in non-precise areas or, in other words, outside the field of science and technology.

It would have been well if the authors had pointed out that the John Crerar is a closed-access library. The typical American library has open access; hence its catalog should be developed with an understanding that the catalog will be by-passed far more often than it is consulted. Yet closed-access libraries, and notably the Library of Congress, have defined American cataloging and classification policy to a great extent, much more than is desirable since they are in a minority. In the case of the classified catalog there may now be a danger that the John Crerar system will be held up as a model because of the publicity attending the publication of the present volume. But insofar as other libraries which exploit a classified catalog have open access, the John Crerar model should not be followed too closely.

There is an area in which the classified catalog may well grow in importance in this country, but again the authors have failed to take full advantage of their central theme. The book catalog is disposed of ("few libraries will find the expense justifiable," p. 76) without any indication that there are enough straws in the wind to show that we are on the verge of a return to the printed book catalog. And with such a return there may well be a preference for the classified form, as the *Lamont Library Catalogue* suggests.

I regret sincerely the necessity of pointing out so many shortcomings because the book has much of importance to say about the management of a classified catalog, especially in the second part, although here too there are puzzling statements and omissions, a situation which came about presumably because many of the practical insights were left for a "decisions file" to supply. However, if topics were sufficiently significant to warrant mention in a classified-catalog code, the practical information ought to have been provided too. For example, when it is

stated that crowded classes should be subdivided (p. 92), some indication could have been given of situations which call for subdivision and of representative ways of subdividing, especially when it is realized that the recommended overall arrangement of a class is chronological (p. 100).

The rules in the second part of the book are in many respects not a reflection of John Crerar practice at the

time of the survey but the library's judgment of what the practice should be. The task of changing rules in the middle of the stream is a difficult one, but the staff has made and will continue to make substantial progress in bringing about improvements. In the course of time the library hopes to refine the quality of the rules themselves. —Andrew D. Osborn, Associate Librarian, Harvard College Library.

REVISED CATALOGING RULES

A revised edition of the *Code for Cataloging Music and Phonorecords* has been approved by the Committee on Descriptive Cataloging. The revision was prepared by a joint committee of the Music Library Association and the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification. The new *Code*, which assembles in one publication all rules for cataloging music and phonorecords, will be published by the American Library Association.—Marian Sanner, Chairman, Committee on Descriptive Cataloging.

CHANGES ON WILSON BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The resignation of Louis J. Bailey from the Board of Directors of The H. W. Wilson Company has just been announced. Mr. Bailey's long and close association with the firm has been part of a notable career in librarianship, including a variety of important administrative posts, among them the chief librarianship of the Queens Borough Public Library, Jamaica, New York, from 1936-1953, and an earlier decade as director of the Indiana State Library. From 1937 to 1946 Mr. Bailey was the official representative of the American Library Association on the Board of Directors of The H. W. Wilson Company, and from 1946 until his resignation he was a regular member of the Board, the first and only person outside the Wilson Company staff to be so honored.

In accepting Mr. Bailey's resignation the Board of Directors passed a resolution expressing their appreciation of the valuable services rendered to the Company by Mr. Bailey during his long association with it.

Edwin B. Colburn has been appointed to the Board of Directors of The H. W. Wilson Company to fill the vacancy created by Mr. Bailey's resignation. Mr. Colburn, who joined the Company in 1954 as Chief of Wilson Indexing Services, came to the firm with a wide background of professional experience and activities. He holds a B.A. from Amherst, a B.S. in Library Science from Columbia, and an M.A. in English from Northwestern University. After serving from 1939 in the stack and preparation divisions of the New York Public Library, he became chief of technical processes at the Northwestern University Library in 1948, and in 1950 he became supervisor of the processing department of the Cleveland, Ohio, Public Library. Among other professional activities he was executive secretary of the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification 1950-1954, and at present he is secretary-treasurer of the Council of National Library Associations and chairman of the Organizing Committee of the new ALA Resources and Technical Services Division.